

# **Center for Human Capacity Development**

**FY 2000**

**R4**

**Results Review and Resource Request**

**Note:**

Non-text files (e.g., spreadsheets, charts, maps, etc.)  
have been appended at the end of the document

## Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Mission Statement		
Part I	Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance	1
Part II	Progress toward Objectives	4
	SSO1, Basic Education	5
	Performance Data Tables	11
	SSO2, Higher Education	31
	Performance Data Tables	37
	SSO3, Training	57
	Performance Data Tables	63
	SSO4, Information	72
	Performance Data Tables	78
Part III	Status of Management Contract	85
Part IV	Resource Request	87

## **Mission Statement**

Education defines the future - for individuals and nations. The Center for Human Capacity Development provides key leadership to create the human foundation required for sustainable growth in all areas of development. In collaboration with USAID missions, other bureaus, donors, and partners; the Center assists nations in building innovative learning systems that provide effective solutions for education and learning that will meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The Center empowers individuals and institutions to improve the access, affordability and quality of formal and non-formal learning systems that provide the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for development. We accomplish this through training educators, leaders, and practitioners for performance improvement; promoting education and training policy reform; ensuring completion of quality basic education; facilitating productive, sustainable institutional partnership linkages; and advancing policies and technologies that promote affordable and equitable access to information. Using a team approach, the Center promotes synergy among the basic education, higher education, training, workforce development, and educational technology communities.

The results are improved abilities to obtain and use information and knowledge for enhanced human productivity, employment, income growth, and social stability. These improvements support U.S. foreign assistance goals to build stable democracies and expand economic growth.

## **Part I. Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance**

### **Introduction**

The Center for Human Capacity Development (G/HCD) is pleased to present our Results Report and Resources Request (R4) for the Year 2000. This R4 documents a year of substantial change, growth and achievement for the Center. We look toward the Year 2000 with pride at what we have accomplished, and anticipation at the achievements that can be expected within the framework for leadership presented here.

The Center provides global programs, technical leadership, field support services, professional training, and applied research for regional bureaus and Missions to develop innovative, high quality and cost-effective programs in:

- \* basic education (SSO1);
- \* higher education and workforce development (SSO2);
- \* U.S. participant, third-country and in-country training (SSO3); and
- \* information policy and applications (Special Objective 1).

In FY97 the Center supported the Agency's human capacity development goal through strong performances by all four teams, as documented in this R4.

### **Factors Affecting Program Performance**

A number of important factors substantially affected program performance, some positive and some otherwise. These include a new Agency policy initiative in human capacity development, increased FY97 financial resources, sharp declines in technical staffing levels in the Center and the Agency as a whole, and successful reengineering of core Center activities.

- \* Under the Agency Strategic Plan, a new Goal for human capacity development was established to include activities in basic education, higher education and workforce development, training, and information technology. During FY97 G/HCD developed new activities in each of our Objectives to help attain the new Goal.
- \* In FY97 G/HCD's OYB was increased to about \$12 million, a 40 percent increase. Despite radical staff cuts, the Center successfully obligated virtually all these funds in effective ongoing programs and innovative new activities that already are achieving important results.
- \* In FY97 G/HCD's staff were reduced from 32 USDH (FY96) to 17 USDH, a sharp decline in educational technical capability matched by severe reductions in field Mission staffing. It is a tribute to the

spirit of G/HCD staff that they absorbed essential responsibilities from the work of departed colleagues, while responding successfully to the additional challenges of the new Agency Goal and increased FY97 funding. Nonetheless, the effectiveness of educational programming throughout the Agency has been placed at risk by these severe technical staff cuts.

- \* In FY97 G/HCD launched a wide-ranging operational restructuring effort to substantially upgrade program performance, including:

Center-wide: With support from M and external management consultants, we began a shift from the existing Office structure to team-based decision-making and program management to empower HCD staff, to strengthen performance accountability, and to enhance our customer orientation.

SSO1: with support from LAC and AFR, two new programs were launched in field-based educational research (IEQ2) and educational communication technology innovation (LearnLink).

SSO2: with support from PPC and LPA, a new university partnership program using microgrants was launched, establishing an Agency interface for dialogue with thousands of universities and community colleges. An expensive and outmoded management support contract was eliminated in favor of direct relations with cooperating partners.

SSO3: with support from IRM, a new desktop-based training MIS provides up to date data to stateside users on the Intranet/Internet, replacing an expensive, unreliable and inaccessible mainframe system. With support from OP, a new HAC contract reduced costs from \$200 per trainee to \$80 per trainee per month. An underutilized contract for English Language Testing was eliminated.

SPO1: with support from AFR, a new Inter-Agency Agreement was negotiated to establish a partnership to address USG information technology and policy objectives in USAID presence countries. The partnership includes USAID, State Department, FCC, Commerce, and the Office of the US Trade Representative.

These extensive management and program innovations, accomplished or set in motion during FY97, position G/HCD to play a more effective role in supporting the new Agency Goal in human capacity development, make more efficient use of scarce staff resources, build on program strengths while effectively addressing some longstanding performance issues, and enhance HCD's tradition of innovation and technical excellence. With this firm foundation established in FY97, G/HCD can effectively address technical

and programmatic leadership objectives within the context of Agency's human capacity development goal in the Year 2000.

As the paragraphs above show clearly, FY97 was a year of major staffing and program challenges for G/HCD. We believe we have met these challenges and emerged with a more cohesive Center and a stronger program well suited to the needs of the Agency.

### **G/HCD in the Year 2000**

Major events in FY98 highlight USAID's ongoing responsibilities in global education and training.

The President's trip to Africa mobilized new support for education investments, and highlighted USAID's role both domestically and internationally. In Africa, the emphasis is on education for girls and out-of-school youth, creating computer-linked community resource centers with access to global information infrastructure, developing community school partnerships and supporting higher education partnerships for development.

The WID Office's upcoming worldwide conference on girl's and women's education has mobilized broad domestic support and international acclaim for USAID leadership in these key areas. With our external partners, G/HCD will co-sponsor a major world conference on human capacity development in calendar year 1999 to give a jump start to cutting edge educational activities in the 21st century.

The Santiago Summit of the Americas focused on primary and secondary education, improving educational quality, distance learning programs, promoting democratic values and environmental stewardship, and workforce development especially for women and displaced workers through lifelong learning programs.

The fact is, human capacity development is critical to achieving sustainable development in all USAID-assisted nations. Moreover, America is viewed around the world as a leading source of technical expertise, institutional commitment, and innovative solutions to complex educational problems. It is likely that USAID will continue to be called on by our partners to play a leadership role in international educational development.

G/HCD's Year 2000 R4 is carefully balanced to maintain core strengths while filling crucial leadership and programmatic gaps within the framework of the Agency HCD Goal.

Our performance targets are high but realistic based on past performance. Part IV, Resource Request, indicates G/HCD proposals to build on this solid performance by filling essential technical leadership and field support roles, tightly focused on a handful of leading edge issues and opportunities. This reflects our judgment that USAID will continue to be looked to -- domestically and internationally -- for effective leadership in human capacity development.

---

## Part II. Progress Toward Objectives

### SSO1: Improved and expanded basic education systems

#### A. Performance Analysis

##### 1. Progress During Past Year

**SSO1: Improved and expanded basic education systems.** The G/HCD basic education team manages a portfolio of leadership activities that made significant advances in developing highly effective basic education programs. These activities include Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL), Improving Educational Quality (IEQ1&2), Global Communications and Learning (GC&L), and Educational Data (ED DATA). Outcomes included: taking stock of what is known about improving basic education; facilitating the adaptation of what is known to meet differing requirements in specific situations; stimulating research and analysis at the local level to guide the application of solutions which address local problems; facilitating the application of new technologies to improve the quality and increase the availability of basic education; and increasing the accuracy, timeliness and accessibility of basic education data. Wording of the SSO and associated performance indicators require results at a world-wide level appropriate to the Agency Goal statement but beyond the manageable interests of the SSO1 team. The team proposes a revision of the SSO1 and associated performance indicators. The “Performance Analysis” section discusses progress under the current SSO1 structure. The “Expected Progress” section outlines the reworded SSO1 and the proposed new performance indicators. Both FY97 Performance Data Tables and proposed new tables are presented.

**IR1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.** This IR has four indicators. The first measured the adaptation and application of technical tools in developing countries. The second measured the techniques used to institutionalize those tools. The third and fourth dealt with dissemination undertaken. Targets were surpassed in all four areas.

**IR1.2: Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.** This IR has two indicators dealing with the development and dissemination of communication strategies for improving basic education. Targets for both were fully met.

**IR1.3: Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.** The target was met: developing an approach for assisting basic education in crisis countries.

##### 2. Explicit Performance Rating

**SSO1: Improved and expanded basic education systems.** Substantial progress in meeting the IR targets was made under SSO1, however strategic objective level indicators were of little use in assessing performance. The SSO-level indicators (national average school access, gender



equity, and 5th grade completion rates) are indicators currently in use at the Agency SO level--an inappropriately high level for indicators of SSO1 performance. We propose revised SSO1 wording and performance indicators within our manageable interest.

**IR1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.** Performance exceeded the targets for the four indicators: 14 adapted tools and strategies were completed vs four planned; 17 techniques were used to institutionalize tools and strategies vs five planned; 12 strategies to encourage adaptation and dissemination were completed vs five planned; and 12 strategies to encourage dissemination were completed as compared to a target of 10.

**IR1.2: Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.** Performance met or exceeded the planned targets: three strategies for developing and disseminating communication models and tools were completed vs two planned. The target of five strategies for adapting and disseminating tools and strategies was met.

**IR1.3: Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.** The planned target of one approach was met.

### 3. Explanation of Results

**SSO1: Improved and expanded basic education systems.** Substantial progress was made under SSO1 in meeting IR targets. These intermediate results do not cumulate to the world-wide changes inappropriately set as performance indicators last year, but they constitute higher-order improvements in policies, in institutions, in learning systems, and in educational data systems. IR-level successes include: (1) pilot introduction of interactive radio technologies increases the accessibility of basic education, influences how instruction is delivered, and improves teaching and school administration; (2) development of assessment techniques helps educators measure student performance; (3) design of simulation models assists decision makers to review options and risks associated with change; (4) mobilization of local basic education research capacity, utilizing teachers, increases their understanding and capacity to improve basic education; and (5) application of computer models facilitates analysis of current education data previously inaccessible to policy makers. In sum, major systemic improvements flow from SSO1's IR level successes, and these improvements to policies, institutions, learning systems and educational data provide the basis for a redefinition of SSO1 that is within G/HCD's manageable interest.

**IR1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.** Tools and strategies adapted and applied in FY97 included: ABEL's software package for community participation (South Africa), a database module for education statistics, ED-ASSIST (Benin), interactive radio (Haiti), early childhood cassette program (Ecuador), a decentralization game, DECIDE (Ghana); IEQ's assessment tools (South Africa, Mali, Guatemala, Ghana, Uganda); LearnLink helping multi-grade community schools for girls, extending English as a second language and assessing primary schools (Egypt).

Successful institutionalizing approaches included: ABEL's tool for assessing critical factors in women's literacy and empowerment programs (Nepal); a primer on planning and policy (Cambodia); creation of an education policy advocacy group (Ecuador); workshops directed at techniques for maintaining reform (South Africa); IEQ-sponsored development of NGO advisory committees (South Africa); partnership with a university research office in which tools were incorporated into its research program (Guatemala); the development of a university center to focus on classroom research (Ghana); the research partner National Examination Board received budgetary support for continuing classroom-oriented work (Uganda); and LearnLink partnership and technology transfer with the Ministry of Education in distance education (Egypt).

Dissemination methods developed included: ABEL's demonstrations of the Planning for Community Participation in Education materials at USAID, the World Bank and the CIES Conference in Mexico; IEQ's national conference in South Africa to highlight the importance of educational quality through the systematic use of monitoring and evaluation to guide policy; and LearnLink's workshops and training on the role of Internet education in Ghana, Mali and Benin. Strategies in FY97 to encourage dissemination included: IEQ's international exchange held in Washington to maximize the utility of research findings for participants from Ghana, Mali, Guatemala, South Africa and Uganda; IEQ's publications including The Quality Link; LearnLink presentations at the Global Knowledge 97 Conference; and LearnLink's web site bulletin board and cybersalons. SSO1 has been very successful in its dissemination activities, but the results of dissemination could have been captured by one indicator. Revised indicators are in the Tables.

**IR1.2: Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.** In Paraguay, a strategy was developed for enhancing basic education opportunities for formal and out-of-school learners through Community Learning Centers with computer assisted instruction and Internet access. Important strategies disseminated under communication technologies included CyberSalons; educational technology handbooks; and the LearnLink website highlighting education and communication technologies.

**IR1.3: Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.** The Global Information Network in Education was designed to provide governments, international organizations, and NGOs with educational services and materials that may be adapted for use in countries in crisis or transition.

#### 4. Policy Interests

Considerable impact was made by SSO1 on the key **Agency Emphasis Areas**. Gender: Under ABEL a paper "Beyond Enrollment" provides dozens of techniques for practitioners to make classrooms more girl-friendly. All ABEL and IEQ activities address gender concerns. Local Partnerships: Each IEQ, GC&L and ABEL field activity depends on collaboration with NGOs, local and national government entities. Donor coordination: SSO1 has made a point of working closely with other international donors. Many of our applications and approaches are being adopted by IBRD. Customer feedback: ABEL has been extremely innovative in developing participatory approaches to education planning and incorporating views of stakeholders. IEQ's

approach to quality focuses on insuring that all of the critical players in education are involved in the educational research process.

**US National Interests.** National security, economic prosperity, the rule of law, protection of human rights, and participation in the democratic process are all improved when citizens benefit from quality basic education. Basic education for girls and women contributes to stabilizing the world population, protecting health and reducing the spread of infectious diseases. Better economic prospects and possibilities for improving education within communities reduces pressures to create crisis situations or emigrate to the US. With greater participation in broad-based economic growth as a result of education, people in the developing world become consumers of US exports and participate in the global economy.

**Foreign Policy Strategies.** The activities under SSO1, particularly GC&L, have played an important role in the current US - Egyptian Partnership (Gore-Mubarak). The goal of this effort is to promote economic growth and job creation in Egypt and to build stronger ties between the private sector of Egypt and the US. G/HCD has worked closely with USAID/Cairo and Subcommittee IV for Education and Human Resource Development to provide leadership in developing the human resources and skills necessary for private sector-led economic growth in Egypt. In planning for the April 1998 Summit of the Americas, where education will be given top priority, HCD staff provided technical advice to LAC's Office of Education. In formulating the President's Africa Education Initiative, G/HCD provided technical papers for the Agency and spoke before the National Security Council.

## **B. Expected Progress through FY2000 and Management Actions**

### **1. Prospects for Achieving Targets**

All of the IR targets were either exceeded or met for FY97. G/HCD expects this level of performance to continue. However, the level of performance depends upon core funding and funding from the Regional Bureaus and Missions. With adequate core funding, the SSO1 team can leverage enormous action in the field. The SSO1 portfolio of activities has been recognized by Regional Bureau and Missions as playing a very important complementary support role. During FY97 Regional Bureaus and Missions provided \$20,100,026 in field support and buy-ins. But if FY98's radical reductions in core funding are sustained, these accomplishments will no longer be possible.

### **2. Management Actions**

As agreed in last year's R4 process, G/HCD developed a revised Strategic Plan. The new strategy addresses weaknesses in the current SSO1, namely the need for reformulation of the strategic objective and refinement of the Intermediate Results and Performance Indicators. The SSO-level indicators (national average school access, gender equity, and 5th grade completion rates) were of little use in assessing performance. While good progress was made in implementing the portfolio, this cannot be reflected in the indicators. The indicator data were only available bi-annually, are three years old, and are beyond HCD's manageable interest. As a

result, G/HCD is proposing a better focused SSO1 "Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments and data, especially for under-served populations" with new performance indicators. The reworded SSO is within the manageable interests of G/HCD and reflects what G/HCD is attempting to accomplish. The proposed new IRs reflect G/HCD's emphasis on improving learning environments, education data, and education for children.

### 3. Results to be Achieved

G/HCD proposes 6 intermediate results critical for attaining SSO1, and will focus its resources on attaining targeted levels of improvements in each of these results areas.

**SSO1: Improved and expanded basic education policies, institutions, learning environments and data, especially for underserved populations.** Three indicators measure progress at the SSO level: (1) number of times strategies, assessments, analyses, techniques, lessons learned, and software packages are applied in the field to improve education policies and institutions (target through FY2000: 27 applications); (2) number of countries applying or testing classroom-level interventions or requesting other direct technical assistance to improve basic education for children and adults (target through FY2000: 13 countries); and (3) number of countries using education survey modules to collect accurate and timely education data in national surveys (target through FY2000: three countries).

**IR1.1: Basic education policies and institutions improved.** Three indicators measure progress: (1) number of collaborations established with institutions and organizations (target through FY2000: 27 collaborations); (2) number of training centers and multilateral organizations incorporating G/HCD strategies, assessments, analyses, techniques, lessons learned, and software packages to improve basic education policies and institutions (target through FY2000: three institutions); and (3) number of participatory basic education policy development procedures (FY2000 target: one comprehensive procedure).

**IR1.2: Formal and out-of-school basic education learning environments improved.** Two indicators measure progress: (1) number of diagnostic studies or applied research activities carried out to increase knowledge about critical factors and interventions that improve the quality of basic education for children and adults (target through FY2000: nine studies or research activities); and (2) number of workshops conducted on research methodology, data analysis or dissemination strategies to increase local capacity for assessing the quality of basic education (target through FY2000: 21 workshops).

**IR1.3: Access to quality basic education improved through the application of education technology.** Two indicators measure progress: (1) the number of models applying education technology developed and tested (target through FY2000: six models); and (2) number of institutions applying these models (target through FY2000: 15 institutions).

**IR1.4: Basic education data collected, analyzed and disseminated.** Four indicators measure progress: (1) number of countries receiving assistance in reviewing and revamping their national education management information system (target through FY2000: seven countries); (2) number

of instruments for improving data collection, analysis or dissemination developed or updated (target through FY2000: four instruments); (3) number of analyses of existing education data from household surveys conducted and results disseminated to improve basic education policy and program planning (target through FY2000: four analyses); and (4) number of times the Global Education Database is requested or downloaded from the Agency Internet and Intranet web pages (target through FY2000: 3000 requests or downloads).

**IR1.5: Improved basic education in countries in crisis or transition.** Two indicators measure progress: (1) number of strategies and operational plans developed to improve basic education in countries in crisis/transition (target through FY2000: two strategies or plans); and (2) number of electronic repositories of accessible information for basic education professionals working in crisis/transition nations developed (FY2000 target: one electronic repository).

**IR1.6: Expanded learning opportunities for under-served children 0 to 6 years.** Three indicators measure progress: (1) number of regional workshops on early childhood policies and practices (target through FY2000: 3 workshops); (2) number of approaches for responding to early childhood needs (target through FY2000: 3 approaches); and (3) number of evaluations, diagnostic studies, and pilot efforts conducted to assess approaches to early childhood needs (target through FY2000: 9 evaluations, studies or pilot efforts).

#### **4. Prognosis for Achieving SSO**

The SSO1 budget level approved last year was cut in half at the beginning of FY98. If restored, the prognosis is excellent that SSO1 targets will be met.

**C. Performance Data Tables** (Beginning on next page)

**D. Environmental Compliance.** No new IEE will be required.

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.1: Primary school access			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Gross enrollment ratio increase of 1% per year  SOURCE: Global Education Database  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:   COMMENTS: This indicator was introduced in 11/96, used in 1997 and will be dropped in 1998 (see section B2, above).	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996(b)		84.5%
	1997	85.5%	92.0%

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.2: Gender equity			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Improvement in girls gross primary ratio of 1.5% per year  SOURCE: Global Education Database  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:  COMMENTS: This indicator was introduced in 11/96, used in 1997 and will be dropped in 1998 (see section B2, above).	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996(b)		84.3%
	1997	85.8%	86.4%

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.3: Primary school achievement			
UNIT OF MEASURE: 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade completion rate increase of 1% per year SOURCE: Global Education Database  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:  COMMENTS: This indicator was introduced in 11/96, used in 1997 and will be dropped in 1998 (see section B2, above).	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996(b)		64.2%
	1997	65.2%	66.6%

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women (See proposed IR 1.1)			
INDICATOR 1.1.1: Technical tools and strategies adapted for and applied within developing countries			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of approaches developed <b>SOURCES:</b> ABEL; IEQ; LearnLink <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Definitions are derived from information provided by Project Managers and the G/HCD SSO1 Team <b>COMMENTS:</b> This indicator has been eliminated to reduce redundancy. <u>Definitions:</u> <i>education reform support:</i> an operational framework for developing policy-analytical and policy-dialectical abilities, and institutional capacities, leading to demand-driven, sustainable, indigenous education policy reform. The purpose is to ensure that education policies, procedures, and institutions empower the system to define, develop, and implement reforms that foster relevant and meaningful learning for all children (p.vi, <i>Education Reform Support</i> : Vol. 1); <i>learning systems:</i> a system in which learning takes place, both in the formal education sector and nonformal sector, that can itself be as simple as one school or as complex as an entire national educational system; <i>tool:</i> an instrument that is used to inform and/or implement a particular activity, i.e., analytical frameworks, software programs, and assessment surveys; <i>strategy:</i> a broad plan of action to solve a specific problem or approach a particular task; <i>approach:</i> the use of the method — either a tool, strategy, or model— or some combination thereof, to support education reform. <u>Description of Tools and Strategies (14):</u> Under ABEL: (1) A package ( <i>Planning for Community Participation in Education</i> ), including a manual and computer diskettes, was developed to assist policy and program planners make informed decisions about community participation in education. (2) A database shell, ED*ASSIST, was developed as part of the core database module for education statistics under development by NESIS. (3) The pilot project in multichannel learning in Haiti was expanded and applied. (4) A study on adult education <i>Adult Education in Asia and the Pacific: Policies, Issues, and Trends</i> , by L. Kaifa Roland was prepared in collaboration with the UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. (5) A decentralization game for policymakers called DECIDE was developed. (6) The development and implementation of an early childhood cassette program in Ecuador was completed. Under IEQ1: (7) In South Africa, training programs in monitoring and evaluation were conducted so that NGOs could design evaluation tools such as a utilization plan of innovative NGO practices, that was applied by the provincial government. (8) In Mali, several assessment tools to measure French language teaching and learning and the quality of education were developed and applied. (9) In Ghana, curriculum-based assessment instruments measuring pupil skills in oral language, reading and writing and teacher performance were developed and applied. (10) In Guatemala, several tools for the evaluation of the Nuevas Escuelas Unitarias (NEU) program were developed and applied. (11) A study was published that focused on the teachers' role and the relationship to student experience and performance in primary schools in Uganda, <i>Antecedents and Consequences of Instructional Practice and Schooling Experience: The Determinants of Achievement in Ugandan Primary Schools</i> , by J.C. Munene, et al., (1997). Under LearnLink: (12) A strategy was developed for strengthening multi-grade community schools for girls in Egypt via pre-service and in-service teacher/facilitator training. (13) A strategy was developed for extending English as a Second Language instruction to multi-grade community schools for girls in Egypt via interactive radio instruction. (14) A strategy was developed for the assessment of the primary school system in Egypt to provide baseline data for teacher and student performance in newly forming multi-grade community schools for girls.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	4	14



TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women (See proposed IR 1.1)			
INDICATOR 1.1.2: Techniques for institutionalizing tools and strategies within and across developing countries			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of approaches applied <b>SOURCES:</b> ABEL; LearnLink; Improving Educational Quality <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Definitions are derived from information provided by Project Managers and the G/HCD SSO1 Team. <b>COMMENTS:</b> This indicator has been split into two indicators--1.1.1 and 1.1.2 for specificity and to highlight the value of collaborations (see proposed new indicators on next page). <u>Definitions:</u> <i>institutionalizing</i> : sustaining the use of a tool, model or strategy within an institution. <u>Techniques for institutionalizing tools and strategies (17):</u> Under ABEL: (1) An evaluation <i>An Analysis of the Impact of Literacy on Women's Empowerment in Nepal</i> examined the impact on women's empowerment of two types of non-formal education programs. (2) A cross-sectoral study <i>How Educating a Girl Changes the Woman She Becomes: An Intergenerational Study in Northern Ghana</i> examined education's impact on household decision-making. (3) A study, <i>HIV/AIDS Education Programs for Youth</i> by Kim Seifert identified low-cost, community-based HIV/AIDS awareness programs in Africa. (4) A compilation of education reform research and case studies, <i>Evaluation and Educational Reform: Policy Options</i> , by Benjamin Alvarez and Monica Ruiz-Casares (Eds.), focused on four levels of evaluation. (5) A study was completed for policymakers <i>Improving Capacity for Policy Analysis and Planning in Cambodia's Ministry of Education</i> by Christopher Wheeler et al. (6) ABEL's <i>Education Reform Support</i> : Vol. 1-6 summarized research on effective ways for donors to support education reform in developing countries. (7) A partnership for institutionalizing education policy reform called APOYO was created in Ecuador. (8) A one-day workshop trained scriptwriters in the national IRI project to integrate positive role models for girls in the scripts. (9) In Cambodia, ABEL provided assistance and training to the Planning Department of the Ministry of Education and Youth through two workshops for office staff. (10) In South Africa, ABEL provided continuing support to the provincial Ministries of Education and NGOs through capacity-building workshops. Under IEQ: (11) IEQ established ad hoc advisory committees for each evaluation conducted by the S. Africa host country research team. (12) In Guatemala, IEQ promoted and supported the host country partner, Universidad del Valle, and shared research findings and literature. (13) In Ghana, IEQ promoted and supported the University of Cape Coast's Centre for Research on Improving the Quality of Primary Education in Ghana (CRIQPEG), and shared research findings and literature. (14) In Uganda, IEQ promoted and supported the Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB), and shared research findings and literature. (15) In Mali, IEQ worked with two host country partners, the National Pedagogic Institute and the Institute for Higher Education and Applied Research, sharing research findings and literature. Under LearnLink: (16) support was given for the formation of a non-formal coalition of teachers and school administrators, partners for the Internet in Education (PIE), in Ghana. (17) Partnerships were formed with Ministry of Education institutions in Egypt for the development of strategies to support multi-grade community schools for girls.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997	5	17

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women (See proposed IR 1.1)			
INDICATOR 1.1.3: Strategies, models and tools developed and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of approaches developed  SOURCES: Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL); Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity (LearnLink); Improving Educational Quality (IEQ)  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: The definitions are derived from information provided by Project Managers and G/HCD SSO1 Team members.  COMMENTS: This indicator has been revised to reflect a new focus on policy--see new indicator 1.1.4. Definitions: model: a programmatic design that serves as a guide for replication. Strategies, models and tools (7): (1) Under ABEL, workshops were held at USAID and the World Bank (December 2-3, 1997) on Education Reform Support (Vol. 1-6). (ABEL Quarterly Report, April-June 1997, p.7) (2) Under ABEL, the framework developed in Education Reform Support: A Framework for Scaling Up School Reform in the United States was disseminated at a conference in South Carolina. (3) Demonstrations of the Planning for Community Participation in Education materials were made to groups at USAID, the World Bank and at the CIES conference in Mexico City, Mexico. (ABEL Quarterly Report, April-June 1997, p.8) (4) Under ABEL, an upgrade of the EPICS Simulation on policy issues in girls' education was completed and demonstrations were conducted at the CIES Conference in Mexico City, Mexico. (5) Under ABEL, the study Adult Education in Asia and the Pacific: Policies, Issues, and Trends was disseminated at UNESCO International Conference on Adult Education held in Hamburg, Germany, July 1997. (6) Under ABEL, the findings in HIV/AIDS Education Programs for Youth were disseminated at several workshops and conferences. (7) Under LearnLink, an essential skills training program was developed and disseminated to female multi-grade, primary classroom facilitators in Egypt.			
	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	5	7

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women (See proposed IR 1.1)			
INDICATOR 1.1.4: Strategies and techniques applied to encourage adaptation and dissemination			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of approaches applied			
<b>SOURCES:</b> Advancing Basic Education and Literacy; LearnLink; Improving Educational Quality			
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> The definitions are derived from information provided by Project Managers and G/HCD SSO1 Team members.			
<b>COMMENTS:</b> This indicator has been revised to focus on training centers and multilateral organizations. See new indicator 1.1.3. <u>Strategies and techniques (10):</u> Under ABEL: (1) The ABEL Clearinghouse continued to respond to requests for educational support materials (publications, tools, resource packages) and has sent out over 900 information packets in response to requests. (2) The Human Capacity Development (HCD) Center asked ABEL 2 to assist it in developing and holding a conference in Washington, DC on July 14-18, 1997. The HCD Conference was a strategy to disseminate information on the issues, topics, programs and activities which the HCD Center sponsors and supports to all USAID staff. (3) Findings in <i>Evaluation and Educational Reform: Policy Options</i> by Benjamin Alvarez and Monica Ruiz-Casares (Eds.) were disseminated at a World Bank workshop, December 2, 1997. Under IEQ1: (4) National conferences (e.g., 12/96 in S. Africa) were conducted to encourage the adaptation and dissemination of educational research findings. (5) International exchanges (e.g., with Ghana, Guatemala, Mali, South Africa and Uganda in 1/97 in Washington, DC) were conducted to encourage dissemination activities that maximize the utility of research findings about learning and within-country research. (6) Country case studies, published papers, and a periodic bulletin, <i>The Quality Link</i> , were produced to encourage the adaptation and dissemination of educational research findings (e.g., <i>The Quality Link</i> , (Number 6, Winter 1997); <i>Collaborative Programme Evaluation: The Improving Educational Quality Project in South Africa</i> (January 1997), and <i>Antecedents and Consequences of Instructional Practice and Schooling Experience: The Determinants of Achievement in Ugandan Primary Schools</i> , by J.C. Munene, et al., 1997) Under LearnLink: (7) Presentations were made to disseminate information at professional conferences (e.g., Global Knowledge '97, the 7/97 HCD Conference, the Society for International Development, and the African Studies Association). (8) The LearnLink web site bulletin board, and LearnLink-sponsored listserves and cybersalons are strategies applied to encourage the adaptation and dissemination of information on education reform support. (9) Special outreach strategies, including tailored demonstrations, on-site workshops and strategic planning sessions, were applied to encourage teachers, school administrators and Ministry of Education officials to support education reform in Ghana, Ethiopia, and Uganda. (10) Workshops were conducted to disseminate information on the role of the Internet in education in Ghana in February 1997 and was the training was tested later in Mali and Benin.			
	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	10	10

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.2: Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women (See proposed IR 1.3)			
INDICATOR 1.2.1: Strategies, models and tools developed and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of approaches developed			
SOURCE: Global Communication and Learning Systems (LearnLink)			
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
COMMENTS: This indicator has been reworded. See new indicator 1.3.1. <u>Strategies and tools (3)</u> : (1) A strategy was developed for the incorporation of interactive radio instruction in English as a Second Language in multi-grade community schools for girls in Egypt. (2) A strategy was developed for enhancing basic education opportunities for formal and out-of-school learners through the establishment of Community Learning Centers with computer-assisted instruction and Internet access in Paraguay. The community learning center model was described and presented at international conferences. (3) An educational technology resource and reference guide was developed as a tool to promote education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems. The <i>Educational Technology Resource Handbook</i> was then ready for dissemination in early November 1997 (FY98).	1997	2	3

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.2: Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women (See proposed IR 1.3)			
INDICATOR 1.2.2: Strategies and techniques applied to encourage adaptation and dissemination			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of approaches applied			
SOURCE: Global Communication and Learning Systems (LearnLink)			
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
COMMENTS: This indicator has been reworded. See new indicator 1.3.2. Strategies and techniques (5): (1) An electronic and print publication series, the <i>LearnLink QuickNote</i> series, on the role of education and communication technologies in support of learning systems, was developed. (2) A <i>LearnLink CyberSalon</i> , an occasional presentation series highlighting the role of education and communication technologies in support of learning systems was launched with three presentations in 1997. (3) There was continued development of content and hyperlinks for the LearnLink web site to encourage broader awareness and discussion of the role of education and communication technologies in support of learning systems. (4) Training on the role of the Internet in education was presented to Mission education partners in Ghana, Uganda, and Ethiopia in partnership with Leland Initiative. (5) Site visits were conducted to Bolivia, Ecuador, Jamaica, India, South Africa and Tanzania for assessment of basic education opportunities through educational technology.	1997	5	5

TO BE REPLACED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.3: Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated (See proposed IR 1.5)			
INDICATOR 1.3.1: Models described and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of approaches developed  SOURCE: Global Information Network in Education, University of Pittsburgh  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:  COMMENTS: This indicator has been reworded. See new indicator 1.5.1. Approach (1): The approach is the design of the system. During FY97, the design process of the system was most important and refinements to it were made throughout the year. Several documents and models related to Bosnia were made available on the web site. Since May 1997, GINIE has been tracking the number of unique sites accessing the site, as well as file transfers (documents uploaded). Between May 1, 1997 and September 30, 1997, a total of 297 unique sites accessed GINIE and a total of 5,534 files were transferred.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	1	1

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.1: Number of times strategies, assessments, analyses, techniques, lessons learned, and software packages are applied in field operations for improving basic education policies and institutions			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of applications	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality, Advancing Basic Education and Literacy	1998	9	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	9	
COMMENTS:	2000	9	
	2001	9	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.2: Number of countries applying or pilot testing classroom-level interventions or requesting other direct technical assistance to improve basic education for children and adults			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality, Advancing Basic Education and Literacy	1998	5	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	4	
COMMENTS:	2000	4	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.3: Number of countries using education survey module to collect accurate and timely basic education data in national household surveys			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: MEASURE-DHS+ Education Activities (EdData)	1998	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	2	
	2001	3	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Basic education policies and institutions improved			
INDICATOR 1.1.1: Number of new USAID, government, and NGO collaborations established to improve basic education policies and institutions			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of collaborations	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality, Advancing Basic Education and Literacy	1998	9	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	9	
COMMENTS:	2000	9	
	2001	9	



PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Basic education policies and institutions improved			
INDICATOR 1.1.2: Number of training centers and multilateral organizations that incorporate G/HCD strategies, assessments, analyses, techniques, lessons learned, and software packages to improve basic education policies and institutions			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of institutions	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Advancing Basic Education and Literacy	1998	1	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	1	
	2001	1	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.1: Basic education policies and institutions improved			
INDICATOR 1.1.3: Number of participatory basic education policy development procedures designed and tested			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of procedures	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Advancing Basic Education and Literacy	1998	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	0	
	2001	0	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.2: Formal and out-of-school basic education learning environments improved			
INDICATOR 1.2.1: Number of diagnostic studies or applied research activities carried out to increase knowledge about critical factors and interventions that improve the quality of basic education for children and adults			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of studies or research activities	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality (IEQ)	1998	3	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	3	
COMMENTS:	2000	3	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.2: Formal and out-of-school basic education learning environments improved			
INDICATOR 1.2.2: Number of workshops conducted on research methodology, data analysis or dissemination strategies to increase local capacity for assessing basic education quality and for promoting policies and practices that improve quality			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of workshops	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality, Advancing Basic Education and Literacy	1998	7	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	7	
COMMENTS:	2000	7	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.3: Access to quality basic education improved through the application of educational technology			
INDICATOR 1.3.1: Number of models applying education technology developed and tested			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of models	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: LearnLink	1998	2	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	2	
COMMENTS:	2000	2	
	2001	2	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.3: Access to quality basic education improved through the application of educational technology			
INDICATOR 1.3.2: Number of institutions applying models of education technology applications			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of institutions	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: LearnLink	1998	5	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	5	
COMMENTS:	2000	5	
	2001	5	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.4: Accurate and timely basic education data collected, analyzed, and disseminated			
INDICATOR 1.4.1: Number of countries requesting and receiving assistance in reviewing and revamping their national education management information system			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL)	1998	3	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	2	
COMMENTS:	2000	2	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.4: Accurate and timely basic education data collected, analyzed, and disseminated			
INDICATOR 1.4.2: Number of instruments (e.g. survey questionnaire modules, software packages, electronic databases) for improving basic education data collection, analysis or dissemination developed or updated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of instruments	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: MEASURE-DHS+ Education Activities (EdData)	1998	2	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	1	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.4: Accurate and timely basic education data collected, analyzed, and disseminated			
INDICATOR 1.4.3: Number of analyses of existing education data from household surveys conducted and results disseminated to improve basic education policy and program planning			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of analyses	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: MEASURE-DHS+ Education Activities (EdData)	1998	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	3	
COMMENTS:	2000	1	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.4: Accurate and timely basic education data collected, analyzed, and disseminated			
INDICATOR 1.4.4: Number of times the Global Education Database is requested or downloaded from the Agency Internet and Intranet web pages			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of requests or downloads	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: IRM-maintained site for monitoring USAID web site use	1998	1000	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1000	
COMMENTS:	2000	1000	
	2001	1000	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.5: Improved basic education in countries in crisis or transition			
INDICATOR 1.5.1: Number of strategies and operational plans developed to improve basic education in countries in crisis or transition			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of strategies and plans	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Educational Quality	1998	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	1	
	2001	1	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.5: Improved basic education in countries in crisis or transition			
INDICATOR 1.5.2: Number of electronic repositories of accessible information for basic education professionals working in crisis and transition nations developed			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of electronic repositories	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Educational Quality	1998	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	0	
	2001	0	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.6: Expanded learning opportunities for underserved children 0 to 6 years old			
INDICATOR 1.6.1: Number of regional workshops held for generating early childhood policies and practices			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of workshops	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: Improving Educational Quality	1998	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	2	
	2001	3	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.6: Expanded learning opportunities for underserved children 0 to 6 years old			
INDICATOR 1.6.2: Number of approaches developed for responding to early childhood needs			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of approaches	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: Improving Educational Quality	1998	1	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	1	
COMMENTS:	2000	1	
	2001	1	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 1: Improved basic education policies, institutions, learning environments, and data, especially for underserved populations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1.6: Expanded learning opportunities for underserved children 0 to 6 years old			
INDICATOR 1.6.3: Number of evaluations, diagnostic studies and pilot efforts conducted to test approaches for responding to early childhood needs			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of evaluations, diagnostic studies or pilot efforts	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCES: Improving Educational Quality	1998	5	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1999	2	
COMMENTS:	2000	2	
	2001	2	



---

**SSO2: Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education's contribution to national development**

**A. Performance Analysis**

**1. Progress During Past Year**

**SSO2: Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education's contribution to national development.** SSO2 sponsors higher education partnerships that (1) reduce child and maternal mortality; (2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; (3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; (4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and (5) enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs. (This formulation of SSO2 simplifies but does not change the substance agreed in the FY99 R4.)

**SSO2 Performance Indicators.** Four performance targets were exceeded and one was substantially met. Leadership development partnerships were present in 24 countries (18 planned). Higher education partnerships were present in 29 countries (30 planned). Higher education networks were active in 16 countries (15 planned). Sixty-one Science Fellows strengthened partnerships (34 planned). Four countries are using partnership-based workforce development programs (1 planned).

**The Activities behind the Intermediate Results.** SSO2 has racked up astonishing accomplishments in FY97. We wish to review the activities that achieved these successes. The UDLP program consists of 41 higher education partnerships with activities in 29 countries. The ATLAS program is present in 24 African nations and has provided training for 245 individuals with 103 completions in FY97. LAWA, a smaller but very successful program, has trained 20 lawyers in Ghana, Uganda and Tanzania. Workforce development implemented best practices and increased partnerships through an IQC mechanism augmented by intensive staff work and team building with overseas partners.

**IR2.1: Reduce Child and Maternal Mortality.** Four individuals in ATLAS obtained Master's or Ph.D.s in health care programs; 57 individuals obtained Master's or Ph.D.s in health programs through university partnerships; and 21 faculty and students participated in professional development programs. Twenty-five best practices in child and maternal health care were adopted in-country. Fifteen partnership linkages were active in this sector.

Highlights: Jahangirnagar and Morgan State University partnership educated rural women in Bangladesh on reproductive health, family planning and use of contraceptives. They also provided obstetric services and micro-credit programs to women. This program contributed significantly to the health and welfare of women and children, and is being replicated in other regions with government support. In ATLAS, a pediatrician from Togo earned her MPH from the University of California at Los Angeles and returned to practice medicine at Lome Teaching Hospital. She trains medical students, nurses and midwives in health care management, and serves as a consultant for the World Health Organization.

**IR2.2: Conserve Biological Diversity and Manage Natural Resources Better.** Ten individuals in ATLAS and seven in UDLP received Master's or Ph.D.s in environmental programs. Twenty-four faculty and students participated in professional development programs. Fifteen environmental plans were adopted in-country. Ten UDLP linkages were active in this sector.

Highlights: the UDLP Escuela Agricola Panamerica and Cornell University partnership worked with nine NGOs to educate extension agents and disseminate information on nutrition, integrated pest management, best agricultural practices, natural resource preservation and conflict resolution. This partnership focused on tropical agriculture and natural resources management but also improved health and helped resolve conflict. With ATLAS, a government employee from Benin completed an MSc in Rural Development at Texas A&M University and now serves as president of the PanAfrican Center for Basic and Applied Research for the Environment and Socio-Economic Development. This organization conducts research on environmental and socio-economic problems in collaboration with local communities, NGOs and national and international institutions.

**IR2.3: Strengthen Markets and Expand Opportunities for the Poor.** Seventy-two individuals in ATLAS and two in UDLP received Master's or Ph.D.s in economic growth programs. Sixty-two faculty and students participated in professional development programs. Technology transfers to strengthen the private sector took place in 17 countries and outreach services to the poor in 9 countries. Eleven UDLP linkages were active.

Highlights: the Association of Carpathian Universities and the Association of Southern Universities formed a higher education leadership network to expand the external efficiency of Carpathian Universities. This network includes 24 US and 28 Carpathian universities with electronic links to diversify funding sources. Carpathian universities are now making business and industry links that focus on joint research, applied technology and public service. As a result of ATLAS training, three businessmen from Togo received MBA degrees in Accounting and now own a prosperous management consulting firm.

**IR2.4: Advance Human Rights and an Active Civil Society.** Seventeen individuals in ATLAS and four in UDLP received Master's, PhDs, or LL.Ms. Sixteen faculty and students participated in professional programs. Fourteen civil society measures were adopted, and six civil society organizations established. Five UDLP linkages were active in this sector.

Highlights: Makerere University and the University of Florida UDLP partnership established the Human Rights and Peace Center in Uganda. Center officials consult with governments on civic education and constitutionalism, reviewing NGO activities in human rights and civic education. The Center publishes in the East African Journal of Human Rights and plays a key role in human rights initiatives for the Great Lakes Region. Under LAWA, a legal practitioner with a private law firm in Malawi, completed an LL.M at the University of Georgia. She is now Principal State Attorney with the Ministry of Justice, using leadership skills to educate and act as an advocate for equal rights and access to the law for women.

**IR2.5: Countries increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.** Peru, Namibia, and Egypt initiated partnerships to increase responsiveness of education to the workplace. Tanzania, Ghana, and Haiti have requested assistance as a spin-off from these efforts. A workforce development country assessment has been completed in Namibia and in Peru.

The workforce workshops provided a forum for first steps in understanding workforce needs, identifying stakeholders, fostering trust and formulating achievable next steps. The emphasis was on developing cost consciousness, with funding options from a combination of local and non-USAID international resources. In three countries, indigenous NGOs emerged to advance workforce planning, illustrating the salience of the issue. One proposed indicator -- number of individuals employed as a result of the workshops -- proved unacceptable due to lack of data. All others were exceeded.

## **2. Explicit Performance Rating**

**SSO-level indicators.** Targets were substantially met or exceeded.

**Indicator 1:** Leadership development partnerships: 24 vs 18 planned.

**Indicator 2:** Higher education partnerships: 29 vs 30 planned.

**Indicator 3:** Higher education networks: 16 vs 15 planned.

**Indicator 4:** Science Fellows strengthen partnerships: 61 vs 34 planned.

**Indicator 5:** Countries using workforce development partnerships: 4 vs 1 planned.

**IR2.1: Reduce Child and Maternal Mortality.** Targets were exceeded.

**Indicator 1:** Adoption of best practices in health by host country: 25 vs 15 planned. **Indicator**

**2:** Individuals using leadership to provide health services: 81 vs 30 planned.

**IR2.2: Conserve Biological Diversity and Manage Natural Resources Better.** Targets exceeded.

**Indicator 1:** Adoption of environmental plans: 15 vs 10 planned.

**Indicator 2:** Individuals transferring skills for local management: 30 vs 15 planned.

**IR2.3: Strengthen Markets and Expand Opportunities for the Poor.** Targets exceeded.

**Indicator 1:** Transfers of technology to the private sector: 17 vs 16 planned.

**Indicator 2:** Individuals use leadership to provide services to poor: 94 vs 30 planned.

**Indicator 3:** Outreach services to the poor: 32 vs 18 planned.

**IR2.4: Advance Human Rights and an Active Civil Society.** Targets were exceeded.

**Indicator 1:** Installation of measures for a democratic society: 14 vs 10 planned.

**Indicator 2:** Individuals using leadership skills: 39 vs 16 planned.

**Indicator 3:** Presence and activity of civil organizations: 9 vs 6 planned.

**IR2.5: Countries increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.** Targets exceeded.

**Indicator 1:** Number of partner institutions selected: 2 vs 1 planned.

**Indicator 2:** Workforce surveys: 2 vs 1 planned.

**Indicator 3:** Employment growth per target country: 500 planned, data not available.

**Indicator 4:** Partnership-based workforce approaches: 4 vs 1 planned.

### 3. Explanation of Results

Analysis of the results demonstrates the success of university partnerships as effective and innovative tools for international development. The long-term, sustainable institutional links and dedication of the partners to problem solving, create a framework to address major development needs. Successful partnerships now serve as regional models for other countries facing similar problems. Leveraged funding in partnerships has ranged from a low of 1:4 to a high of 1:10, strongly multiplying the impact of each USAID dollar invested.

Regional workshops in Peru and Namibia responded to workforce development needs and resulted in new liaisons and formation of two new indigenous NGOs. Groundwork was prepared in FY97 to create an education/business partnership in Alexandria, Egypt as a model to foster relevancy in technical schools. Over 20 specific partnerships were initiated from these conferences. Resources from the private sector were leveraged for the workshops in Peru, and the European Union and Commonwealth Secretariat supported the workshop and subsequent activities in Namibia.

Three regional conferences in India, Ghana and Honduras will highlight the successes and impacts of UDLP and address issues of partnership durability, a current HCD and PPC interest. UDLP has been described as one of the most successful programs in the international education development field generating continued requests for funding. Pilot workforce activities continue to contribute to our understanding of what works in responding to the challenges of the global workforce in transition.

### 4. Policy Interests

**Agency Emphasis Areas.** Three regional meetings with Tulane, Washington State and Purdue Universities and several seminars in Africa with US trained leaders of African universities, NGOs and private sector businesses provided input to the higher education policy paper, the Agency's strategic plan, and design of the President's Africa education initiative. While 34 percent of all long term training is for women, there is a need for greater gender equity in higher education partnerships. Multiple donor resources, including EU and the Commonwealth Secretariat, have facilitated workforce initiatives. The highly leveraged partnerships command collaborative resources from a range of other public and private donors as well as foundations.

**US National Interests.** Over sixty higher education and workforce partnerships developed viable trading partners thus fostering US economic prosperity and national security. Promotion of democracy abroad is a fundamental tenet of our own national interest. The Regional Conflict Mediation Partnership in Honduras has impacted the surrounding countries and is replicable in other regions. The Uganda Human Rights and Peace Center has received attention from the highest levels of the State Department and will assist to implement US foreign policy. Law advocates for women have advanced democracy for all citizens, especially for females by

passing equity laws through their parliaments. Solutions to global issues, developed through partnerships, provide mutual benefits such as conservation of biological diversity, natural resources management, and prevention of the spread of infectious diseases. Knowledge gained through this informs and educates the larger US population, internationalizes campuses and provides research opportunities.

**Foreign Policy Strategies.** SSO2 higher education and workforce activities directly support US foreign policy interests. Economic growth has been enhanced by partnership activities and leadership training in the business and agricultural sectors in Mexico, Honduras, Egypt, Jordan, India, and Indonesia. Workforce development initiatives which directly contribute to economic growth and internal stability have been initiated in Haiti, Guyana, Peru, Namibia, Egypt, Uganda, Tanzania and India. University linkages in Honduras, Jordan, Ghana and Indonesia address global environmental issues such as water resource management, biodiversity, forest fires, desertification and control of pesticide use. The democratic process has been strengthened by the establishment of civil society organizations and legal training programs in Honduras, Ghana, Eritrea and Uganda. Partnership activities targeting population growth, child and maternal health, and the spread of infectious diseases are present in Mexico, Guatemala, Uganda, Kenya, Malawi, Bangladesh and India. ATLAS has programs in Guinea, Benin, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, South Africa, Mali, Senegal, Tanzania, Namibia, Uganda, Madagascar and Malawi.

## **B. Expected Progress through FY 2000 and Management Actions**

### **1. Prospects for Achieving Targets**

The SSO2 program is a phenomenal success as indicated by the FY97 results. There is every reason to expect that the out-year targets will be attained and exceeded. Nonetheless we are not content to rest and have taken action to surpass these results as indicated below.

### **2. Management Actions**

The SSO2 team will focus on careful implementation to consolidate and extend the successful results of the portfolio. Through FY 2000 we expect leadership skills development, policy networking and institutional partnership initiatives, including community college workforce pilots, to expand substantially, with increased emphasis on the interdependency with basic education and the response to education in crisis situations. Representatives of EGAD, DG, WID and HCD have formed a coalition to frame a combined agency response to emerging workforce development needs.

### **3. Results to be Achieved**

Through FY2000: developing countries (10-15) will participate in higher education networks which will have been instrumental in the adoption of policies and program approaches that reflect national development goals; developing countries (35) will have benefitted from applied technology transfer provided by higher education and workforce development partnerships; developing countries (40) will have benefitted from technology transfer via leadership skills for

national development goals and developing countries (2-4) will have built workforce development programs.

#### **4. Prognosis for Achieving SSO**

At the projected resource levels for SSO2, G/HCD will be able to attain minimal targets. However, the potential for this program to grow is vast -- in terms of country level activity and in terms of the level of collaboration with US institutions of higher education. G/HCD will pursue every opportunity to obtain regional bureau and field Mission support for this program, thus augmenting foreseeably slim core funding resources.

#### **C. Performance Tables** (Beginning next page)

**D. Environmental Compliance.** SSO2 will have two new Results Packages this year -- one for a next-generation ATLAS follow-on (PALS) and another for Global Workforce in Transition. IEEs will be prepared for these activities.

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INDICATOR 2.0.1:** Number of target countries using partnership-based leadership training

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>1</sup> number of target countries	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCES:</b> ATLAS Trainee Database, ATLAS Program, African American Institute, New York, NY; LAWA Report on Accomplishments of LAWA Program Alumnae, January 1995-December 1997, Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship Program, Georgetown University.	1996	10	16
	1997	18	24
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Partnership-based leadership training is defined as the training provided through the ATLAS training program. Individuals participate in academic programs at the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. levels.	1998	22	
	1999	26	
<b>COMMENTS:</b> The countries represented in the ATLAS training program in FY97 are: Benin, Cape Verde, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, and Togo. In addition, there were nine trainees who either did not complete academic programs or did not return home in FY97 from the Central African Republic, Comoros, Nigeria, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia. In addition, LAWA works with Ghana.	2000	30	
	2001	35	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>1</sup>“Cumulative” in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INDICATOR 2.0.2:** Number of target countries using sustainable higher education partnerships

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>2</sup> number of target countries	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project	1996	20	29
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Higher education partnerships are defined as formal relationships between U.S.-based and host country institutions of higher learning with the principal goal of revitalizing and strengthening higher education in the host country.	1997	30	29
<b>COMMENTS:</b> Several countries had multiple partnerships, resulting in 41 active partnerships in FY97: Argentina, Bangladesh, Belize, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Thailand, and Uganda. Botswana and Tunisia had partnerships that officially closed in FY96, but the institutional relations between the universities have continued.	1998	32	
	1999	34	
	2000	36	
	2001	40	
	2002		
	2003		

---

"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.



**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INDICATOR 2.0.3:** Number of countries using sustainable higher education networks

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>3</sup> number of target countries <b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Quarterly Reports, Higher Education Partnerships for Development Project <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Higher education networks are defined as relationships among national and regional organizations which facilitate policy dialogue on higher education. <b>COMMENTS:</b> Three networks were operational in FY97. The countries included are: Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Ecuador, Venezuela, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Ukraine, Uganda, Tanzania, Ghana, Zambia, and South Africa.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996	3	12
	1997	15	16
	1998	20	
	1999	25	
	2000	30	
	2001	40	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>3</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INDICATOR 2.0.4:** Number of partnerships strengthened by Science Fellows

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>4</sup> number of AAAS/USAID Science Fellows	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCE:</b> Innovative Scientific Research Project, American Association for the Advancement of Science	1996	0	28
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Science Fellows strengthen partnerships by enhancing the role of American scientific institutions in international development.	1997	34	61
<b>COMMENTS:</b> The FY97 program originally included 35 fellows; two men left the program mid-year. Of the 33 remaining, 29 were domestic fellows (12 men and 17 women); four were international fellows (1 man and 3 women).	1998	40	
	1999	45	
	2000	50	
	2001	55	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>4</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INDICATOR 2.0.5:** Number of target countries using partnership-based workforce development approaches

**UNIT OF MEASURE:** Number of target countries

**SOURCE:** The Center for Workforce Development, Education Development Center; US-Egyptian Secretariat of the Gore-Mubarak Sub-Committee on Education

**INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:** The principal approach was working with host-country partners to create collaborative relationships among host country institutions engaged in workforce development.

**COMMENTS:** Workforce development partnerships were formed as a result of activities conducted in Egypt, India, Namibia, and Peru.

YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
1996	0	0
1997	1	4
1998	3	
1999	9	
2000	12	
2001	15	
2002		
2003		

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.1:</b> Partnerships transfer technology and skills to build local child and maternal health care			
<b>INDICATOR 2.1.1:</b> Adoption of best practices by host-country partners			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>5</sup> number of best practices adopted <b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project; LAWA Report on Accomplishments of LAWA Program Alumnae, January 1995-December 1997, Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship Program, Georgetown University. <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Adoption of best practices is defined broadly as improved knowledge and application of health practices and nutrition, and improved access to health services. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The best practices included in this table for FY97 are: 1) analysis of ingredients and mixtures of common foodstuffs in Kenya; 2) educational poster developed and disseminated on “Inter-institutional Collaboration to Improve the Nutrition of Young Children in Kenya; 3) geriatric care training for 15 participants in India; 4) life adjustment skills workshop for adolescent girls in India; 5) three-day camp on cleanliness, AIDS, causes of common diseases, and the need for education for women in India; 6) technology training for veterinarians from Malawi; 7) vaccination campaign that led to increase rates of vaccination in experimental areas in Mali; 8) education program about contraceptives increased contraceptive use among rural women in Bangladesh; 9) training food science students for certification to test food for FDA standards and quality in Mexico; 10) use of goat milk and meat to decrease protein deficiency in infants and children in Malawi; 11) use of a new method to cook soybeans without changing their flavor and incorporating them into local recipes to increase dietary protein in Malawi; 12) established a community health surveillance and education program for Busiro North District, Uganda; and 13) developed the FIDA Handbook on Domestic Violence in Ghana.  Fifteen of the 41 linkages programs focused their primary activities in the areas of Health, Population, and Nutrition (HPN). In addition, two other partnerships reported impacts in HPN.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	12
	1997	15	25
	1998	20	
	1999	25	
	2000	30	
	2001	40	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>5</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.1:</b> Partnerships transfer technology and skills to build local child and maternal health care			
<b>INDICATOR 2.1.2:</b> Individuals using advanced leadership skills to build local child and maternal health care capacity			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>6</sup> number of leaders trained and current positions of responsibility <b>SOURCE:</b> ATLAS Trainee Database, ATLAS Program, African American Institute, New York, NY; FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Number of individuals who completed academic programs in health fields and returning home in FY97.  Data are not yet available to measure current positions of responsibility. <b>COMMENTS:</b> ATLAS participants were from Guinea (1), Madagascar (1), and Senegal (2). UDLP participants were from India (57). The ATLAS academic programs classified as health in FY97 were all public health.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	20
	1997	30	81
	1998	40	
	1999	50	
	2000	60	
	2001	70	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>6</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.2:</b> Partnerships create adoption plans for managing natural resources and biologically diverse ecosystems			
<b>INDICATOR 2.2.1:</b> Adoption of agreed-to plans and practices by partners who manage natural resources and biologically diverse ecosystems			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>7</sup> number of adoptions of agreed-to plans and practices by partners who manage natural resources and biologically diverse ecosystems <b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Adoption of agreed-to practices and plans is broadly defined as application of knowledge about better resource management gained through the partnership or from the partners.  Partners may be governments, farmers, or land owners. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The agreed-to plans and practices included in the table for FY97 are the following: 1) adoption of the National Plan to Combat Desertification by the Chilean government; 2) natural resources professionals are using a new genetics laboratory in Belize; 3) farmers in Costa Rica use lime and manganese on soil around citrus trees to reduce the severity of corky root syndrome; 4) dairy farmers in Costa Rica use perennial peanut as pasture; 5) farmers in Costa Rica plant perennial peanut between rows of sorghum to act as a natural herbicide; 6) citrus farmers in Costa Rica use nutrient control techniques rather than oil sprays to deter pests; 7) shallot farmers in Indonesia use a new biological control system for the armyworm; and 8) adoption of a model for studying rainfall in mining areas by the Ghanaian government.  Ten of the 41 linkages projects concentrated their activities in the area of environment (ENV). In addition, one other program reported impacts in the ENV area.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	7
	1997	10	15
	1998	12	
	1999	14	
	2000	18	
	2001	25	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>7</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.2:</b> Partnerships create adoption plans for managing natural resources and biologically diverse ecosystems			
<b>INDICATOR 2.2.2:</b> Individuals transfer technology and skills to build local management capacity			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>8</sup> number of leaders trained and current positions of responsibility <b>SOURCE:</b> ATLAS Trainee Database, ATLAS Program, African American Institute, New York, NY; FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Number of individuals completing academic programs related to the environment and returning home in FY97.  Data are not yet available to measure current positions of responsibility. <b>COMMENTS:</b> FY97 ATLAS participants were from Cape Verde (3), Congo (1), Madagascar (1), Mozambique (2), Namibia (1), and Senegal (2). UDLP participants were from Ecuador (2), Indonesia (2), and Madagascar (3). The ATLAS academic programs classified as environment are: Natural Resource Management (4), Environmental Engineering (1), Water Desalinization (2), Food Processing Technology (2), and Marine Biology (1).	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	13
	1997	15	30
	1998	25	
	1999	35	
	2000	45	
	2001	55	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>8</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.3:</b> Partnerships expand access to technology, skills, and outreach services for the poor, thus strengthening the private sector			
<b>INDICATOR 2.3.1:</b> Partnerships adopt and transfer technology to the private sector			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>9</sup> number of target countries in which technology transfer takes place	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project	1996	0	15
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Adopt and transfer technology is broadly defined as an exchange of technological equipment or technical knowledge.  The private sector is broadly defined as any business or voluntary institution.	1997	16	17
	1998	20	
	1999	25	
	2000	30	
	2001	35	
<b>COMMENTS:</b> The countries in which technology transfer to the private sector took place are: Chile, Belize, Guyana, Honduras, Costa Rica, Mexico, Thailand, Indonesia, India, Nepal, Senegal, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda, Madagascar, Morocco and Jordan.  Eleven of the 41 partnerships focus primarily on Economic Growth (EG). In addition, fifteen other partnerships reported impacts in this area. While technology was transferred in 17 countries, there were 36 occurrences of technology transfer to the private sector.	2002		
	2003		

<sup>9</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.



<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.3:</b> Partnerships expand access to technology, skills, and outreach services for the poor, thus strengthening the private sector			
<b>INDICATOR 2.3.2:</b> Individuals use advanced leadership skills to provide services to the poor			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>10</sup> number of leaders trained and current positions of responsibility <b>SOURCE:</b> ATLAS Trainee Database, ATLAS Program, African American Institute, New York, NY; FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Number of individuals completing academic programs related to economic growth (EG) and returning home in FY97.  Data are not available to measure current positions of responsibility. <b>COMMENTS:</b> In FY97, ATLAS participants were from Benin (10), Cape Verde (9), Congo (2), Equatorial Guinea (1), Guinea (2), Guinea Bissau (4), Madagascar (11), Malawi (10), Mali (3), Mozambique (3), Namibia (2), Niger (4), Sao Tome and Principe (1), Senegal (2), South Africa (1), Tanzania (6), and Togo (1). UDLP participants were from Madagascar (1) and Malawi (1). The ATLAS academic programs classified as economic growth are: Business Administration (29), Economics (10), Agricultural Economics (6), Rural Development (1), Engineering (15), Computer Science (1), Agriculture (8), Sciences (2).	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	20
	1997	30	94
	1998	40	
	1999	50	
	2000	60	
	2001	70	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>10</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.3:</b> Partnerships expand access to technology, skills, and outreach services for the poor, thus strengthening the private sector			
<b>INDICATOR 2.3.3:</b> Partnerships adopt and transfer technology, skills, and outreach services to the poor			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>11</sup> number of host country partners <hr/> <b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project <hr/> <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Adopt and transfer technology, skills, and outreach to the poor is defined as an exchange of equipment, technical knowledge, services, or training.  The poor are broadly defined as people living in rural areas, small scale farmers, or those whom the partner reports specified as poor. <hr/> <b>COMMENTS:</b> In FY97, the university and extended partners who transferred technology or provided outreach to the poor are the following: Makerere University, Uganda; Ecole National d'Economie Appliquee, Senegal; Center for Vocational Education, India; University of Nairobi at Kabete, Kenya; Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia; Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh; Escuela Agricola Panamericana Zamorano, Honduras; Universidad de Costa Rica; Universidad Nacional-Heredia, Costa Rica; Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi; Aldea Global, Honduras; ANAF AE, Honduras; Belize Audubon Society; Belize Center for Environmental Studies; COSECHA, Honduras; Center for Torture Victims, Uganda; DENIVA, Senegal; Family Planning Training and Service Center, Bangladesh; IIRR, Ecuador; CIDICCO, Honduras; Legal Aid Project, Uganda; Mexican Health Foundation; Monkey Bay Wildlife Sanctuary, Belize; PANACAM, Honduras; PRR, Honduras; Pallimangal Mangal Kendra, Bangladesh; Pastoral de la Tierra/MISEREOR, Honduras; Program for Belize; Proyecto Guayape, Honduras; UNICEF, Uganda; Uganda Association of Women Lawyers; and World Neighbors, Honduras.  Eleven of the 41 partnerships focus primarily on Economic Growth (EG). In addition, fifteen other partnerships reported impacts in this area. No data were available on which partners provided outreach in FY96.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	16
	1997	18	32
	1998	21	
	1999	25	
	2000	30	
	2001	35	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>11</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.4:</b> Partnerships strengthen rules regarding human rights and increase democratic governance within civil society organizations			
<b>INDICATOR 2.4.1:</b> Installation of agreed measures, practices, and activities			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>12</sup> number of measures, practices, and activities established <b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project; LAWA Report on Accomplishments of LAWA Program Alumnae, January 1995-December 1997, Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship Program, Georgetown University <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Installation of measures, practices, and activities is defined as partners conducting activities or establishing practices that contribute to upholding human rights or enforcing democratic governance. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The measures, practices, and activities included in this table for FY97 are the following: 1) short journalism class on media neutrality, Asmara University, Eritrea; 2) needs assessment of civic education and constitutionalism and a review of NGO activities in the human rights field, HURIPEC, Uganda; 3) workshop on minorities, HURIPEC, Uganda; 4) conflict mediation between the Chortis and local land owners mediated in Copan, Zamorano-Cornell University, Honduras; 5) conflict mediation between indigenous ethnic groups and recent migrants on the border of the Rio Platano Biosphere, Zamorano-Cornell University, Honduras; and 6) informational pamphlet entitled “Legal Requirements for Formation of NGOs in Uganda for a USAID project, PRESTO.”  Five of the 41 linkages programs focused primarily on Democracy and Governance (DG) activities. In addition, two other partnerships reported impacts in this area.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	8
	1997	10	14
	1998	15	
	1999	20	
	2000	25	
	2001	30	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>12</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.4:</b> Partnerships strengthen rules regarding human rights and increase democratic governance within civil society organizations			
<b>INDICATOR 2.4.2:</b> Individuals use advanced leadership skills to strengthen rule of law, respect for human rights, access to equal opportunity, and governmental accountability			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>13</sup> number of leaders trained and current positions of responsibility <b>SOURCES:</b> ATLAS Trainee Database, ATLAS Program, African American Institute, New York, NY; LAWA Report on Accomplishments of LAWA Program Alumnae, January 1995-December 1997, Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship Program, Georgetown University; FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Number of individuals completing academic programs related to Democracy and Governance (DG) and returning home in FY97. Data are not available to measure current positions of responsibility for ATLAS trainees. <b>COMMENTS:</b> In FY97, ATLAS participants were from Benin (5), Guinea (1), Malawi (1), Mozambique (3), Namibia (7), and Niger (1). Five women from Ghana, Tanzania, and Uganda completed LAWA's program in 1997. UDLP participants were from Eritrea (2), Senegal (1), and Uganda (1). The ATLAS academic programs classified as democracy and governance are: Public Administration (4), Urban Planning (1), Education (7), Communications (4), Law (1).	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	13
	1997	16	40
	1998	20	
	1999	25	
	2000	30	
	2001	35	
	2002		
2003			

<sup>13</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.4:</b> Partnerships strengthen rules regarding human rights and increase democratic governance within civil society organizations			
<b>INDICATOR 2.4.3:</b> Increased presence and activity of civil society organizations			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Cumulative <sup>14</sup> number of civil society organizations established	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCES:</b> FY97 Annual and Quarterly Reports from partner institutions, University Development Linkages Project; LAWA Report on Accomplishments of LAWA Program Alumnae, January 1995-December 1997, Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship Program, Georgetown University	1996	0	3
	1997	6	9
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Increased presence and activity of civil society organizations is defined as an increase in the number of civil society organizations or in the instances of civil society organizations' involvement in the community.	1998	9	
	1999	12	
<b>COMMENTS:</b> The following NGOs were created in FY97: 1) Association of Guineans (Bissau) Trained in the USA; 2) CARE Foundation (Ghana); 3) Constitutional Connections (Uganda); 4) HURIPEC Internship Alumni Club (Uganda); 5) Law and Advocacy for Women-Uganda; and 6) Women's Business and Assistance Agency (Ghana). In addition to the NGOs established this year, many were strengthened by their involvement in the UDLP program. Twenty-five NGOs were involved in UDLP programs, one of which is actually a network of 26 small NGOs.	2000	15	
	2001	18	
	2002		
	2003		

<sup>14</sup>"Cumulative" in each of the units of measure is counted as cumulative since the baseline year 1996.

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.5:** Increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs

**INDICATOR 2.5.1:** Number of partner institutions identified and selected

**UNIT OF MEASURE:** Partners participating in workforce development

**SOURCE:** The Center for Workforce Development, Education Development Center

**INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:** "Partners identified and selected" is defined as those attending the country workshops.

**COMMENTS:** Foundations were established in Namibia and Peru as a result of the workshops to formalize in-country workforce initiatives.

The contractor reports that their key role was to serve as a catalyst. The goal was to leverage additional resources through the initial workshops which could lead to an increased number of key people and institutions becoming involved in the solutions to the workforce problems. They report that over 20 specific collaborative partnerships are known to have emerged as a result of the workshops that are focusing on leveraging resources and mobilizing stakeholders. They are in various stages of development from initial discussions to fully-funded programs ready to begin.

YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
1996	0	0
1997	1	2
1998	2	
1999	3	
2000	6	
2001	6	
2002		
2003		

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.5:** Increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs

**INDICATOR 2.5.2:** Completed labor market, demographic, economic, and community surveys

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of surveys completed	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCE:</b> The Center for Workforce Development, Education Development Center	1996	0	0
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> The surveys contain a general country report and an analysis of labor market needs.	1997	1	2
<b>COMMENTS:</b> Two country assessments were completed in Peru and Namibia, providing a framework for the subsequent workforce development workshops in those countries.	1998	3	
	1999	4	
	2000	6	
	2001	6	
	2002		
	2003		

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.5:** Increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs

**INDICATOR 2.5.3:** Employment grows in target country

**UNIT OF MEASURE:** People employed in communities

**SOURCE:** The Center for Workforce Development, Education Development Center

**INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:** The collaborative partnerships are responsible for creating employment generation programs.

**COMMENTS:** <sup>1</sup> Data are not available for this measure. The contractor reports that the goal of the project activities in FY97 was to generate collaboration and create partnerships and networks which would lead to employment programs, using the information from the Compass to Workforce Development Study and other information. Increased employment as a result of workforce development workshops proved an unacceptable measure due to the multiple variables affecting employment.

YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
1996	0	0
1997	500	<sup>1</sup>
1998	1,500	
1999	4,500	
2000	6,000	
2001	7,500	
2002		
2003		



**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.5:** Increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs

**INDICATOR 2.5.4:** Number of laws or policy changes implemented which increased incentives for private and public/private response to workforce development

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of laws and policies  <b>SOURCE:</b> The Center for Workforce Development, Education Development Center  <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b>   <b>COMMENTS:</b>	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	0
	1997	0	0
	1998	3	
	1999	6	
	2000	9	
	2001	12	
	2002		
	2003		

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education and thereby: 1) reduce child and maternal mortality; 2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; 3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; 4) advance human rights and an active civil society; and 5) increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

**APPROVED:** DD/MMM/YYYY

**COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** G/HCD

**INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.5:** Increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs

**INDICATOR 2.5.5:** Number of workers and entrepreneurs graduating from workforce programs employed within six weeks of program completion

<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of graduates employed  <b>SOURCE:</b> The Center for Workforce Development, Education Development Center  <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b>  <b>COMMENTS:</b> <sup>1</sup> The contractor has requested that the workshop coordinators in Namibia and Peru survey the NGO representatives who participated in the conference to determine the number of graduates from the programs they instituted following the workshops. Data will be forthcoming.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	0
	1997	0	<sup>1</sup>
	1998	0	
	1999	500	
	2000	5,000	
	2001	50,000	
	2002		
	2003		

**SSO3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations.**

*"Training is a critical component of all our work and is intimately connected to the activities we fund in every sector. Training builds the human and institutional capacity that can make a modest investment by USAID last for generations." Brian Atwood, July 15, 1997.*

**A. Performance Analysis**

**1. Progress During Past Year**

**SSO3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations.** FY97 activities moved G/HCD well along in achieving targets for SSO3. From a total of seven SO- and IR-level results, targets were exceeded in four, met in two, and not met in one. SSO3 team's activities to reengineer the Agency's approach to training and instill Best Practices provided Missions and Bureaus with tools and guidance to maximize the impact of training investments, and concretely to support the Third Goal.

**SSO3 Indicator 1: Application of new skills to performance gaps.** Some 70 to 88 percent of returned participants from four regions were "able to do their job better" as a result of their training. The planned 25 percent of returnees "applying skills to identified performance gaps" is a more narrowly defined measure. Current surveys at our disposal do not focus on closing specific performance gaps. For the time being the SSO3 team will use the broader indicator because it is available and appropriate. The more precise indicator addressing performance gaps will be used when TraiNet (Training Results and Information Network), a new USAID training database and strategic design and management tool, comes into use in FY98; and to the extent Missions conduct performance gap analyses.

**SSO3 Indicator 2: Decrease in the non-returnee rate.** G/HCD was able to continue the outstanding record compiled over the last few years. The non-returnee rate, now calculated as the percentage of cases reported to INS of the total number of participants completing training in the year, was a low 0.6 percent (compared to a planned 5 percent using a definition dependent on monitoring in the field). The new indicator is a more stringent indicator since it captures all formal delinquents, not just those captured by inconsistent field reports. A low non-returnee rate is a prerequisite to a results-based training system. This result will change next year to the inverse: high returnee rates are sustained or improved.

**IR3.1: USAID training policy and practice improved.** This IR has two performance indicators. The first is "use of trainee-stakeholder agreements defining training purposes and responsibilities entered into." This encapsulates the central SSO3 technical message of reengineered training, that training is to solve identified performance gaps. Results hugely exceeded planned levels. The IR originally assumed that Missions would use stakeholder agreements in FY97 for only long-term participants, and therefore we set a target of 10 agreements. Best Practices teaching was far more widely embraced, however, and agreements were written for many short-term participants, for a total of 1,356 agreements.

The second indicator is "use of Best Practices." This measures the number of SO teams using "Best Practices", defined here as strategic design, stakeholder involvement, and follow-on for fostering training application on the job. The application of "Best Practices" has guided Missions from viewing training primarily as a procedural input to viewing it as a results-focused intervention that must be strategically coordinated with other related programmatic activities. In FY97, 145 SO teams used these core "Best Practices", substantially meeting the target of 150.

**IR3.2: Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID training.** This IR has three performance indicators. The first is "GTD (Global Training for Development) programming mechanism meets Mission needs." This is measured by the number of Mission buy-ins to GTD, a major SSO3 mechanism to design and manage a reengineered training portfolio using "Best Practices". Begun near the end of FY96, GTD had only two buy-ins in that year. Fifteen were targeted for FY97; the actual number was 47. Since Missions in FY97 needed a replacement for the Partners in Education and Training (PIET) contract, the number of buy-ins was three times greater than planned.

The second performance indicator is "increased cost-sharing by stakeholders and partners in USAID-sponsored training." This is measured by aggregate cost-sharing as a percent of total program cost. After setting 5 percent as the FY97 target, USIA's annual report to Congress calculated total public and private sector cost-sharing at 45 percent for FY96 and FY97, based on USAID cost data. Also, many IAP66A (visa) forms indicate non-USAID co-funding. A cost containment study, originally anticipated for FY97, will be completed in FY99. It will provide several programmatic options for increasing cost-sharing. G/HCD greatly exceeded the target for cost-sharing.

The third performance indicator is "number of Missions using TraiNet." Thirty Missions were targeted for introduction of the system in FY97. However, IRM's concern over the possible impact of TraiNet on NMS led to lengthy compatibility-testing (and contributed several valuable software improvements). Instead of 30 initial adopter Missions, we settled for intensive testing in five "early adopter" Missions in FY97. TraiNet will provide uniform worldwide data and eventually the framework for a fully reengineered training process. Final approval and release of TraiNet by IRM is now expected in May 1998. Although major progress was made, this target was not met.

## **2. Explicit Performance Rating**

**SSO3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations.** Both SSO-level results exceeded the targets.

**IR3.1: USAID training policy and practice improved.** The target of 10 "trainee-stakeholder agreements" was greatly exceeded, due to the application of this best practice to a much wider segment of the participant population. The 145 "SO teams using Best Practices" was within 5 percent of the target 150 and thus substantially met the target.

**IR3.2: Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID**

**training.** The number of GTD buyins exceeded the FY97 target. The amount of cost-sharing also exceeded the target. The target number of TraiNet adoptions was not met.

### 3. Explanation of Results

**SSO3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations.** Traditionally USAID has considered training in terms of filling general skills deficits of individuals. Now the Agency is focusing on specific workplace performance gaps which impede the achievement of SO results. Workplace performance gap analysis is crucial to the application of reengineering to training, a need which SSO3 is addressing through technical leadership and assistance. It is crucial that the Agency maintain a very low rate of non-returnees, for political as well as programmatic reasons. The measure is based on cases reported to INS, the most practical means available.

**IR3.1: USAID training policy and practice improved.** Along with performance gap analyses, trainee-stakeholder agreements are part of the crucial "Best Practices" of training. As they become more widely adopted, it will be possible to monitor the full impact of the agreements. Extra effort is needed to ensure quality training programs in host countries.

**IR3.2: Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID training.** GTD's original design assumed continued high levels of training. Given the downward turn in participant enrollments and training budgets, G/HCD will reexamine how well GTD meets customer needs. An evaluation will be needed in FY99. Cost-effectiveness needs to be examined.

### 4. Policy Interests

**Agency Emphasis Areas.** Customer feedback. A major means for obtaining feedback is the technical assistance TDYs conducted by SSO3 staff. In revising ADS253, SSO3 actively sought and made maximum use of feedback from all quarters. We have made use of the Center's HCD Report and Web site to engage in a dialogue with customers and partners. Similar feedback was obtained at the July 1997 G/HCD Conference. Gender. The trend towards increasing the percentage of women participating in both long- and short-term programs continues to rise, from 37 percent in FY96 to 40 percent in FY97. This is in part due to the shift to more short-term training that is conducive to higher female participation. Partnerships. During FY97, we signed an Interagency Agreement with the Peace Corps for follow-on support service in countries where both agencies are operating. In addition to the RSSA agreement for technical staff, other USDA programmatic resources and long-standing linkages to US universities are utilized to further the goals of both agencies. Partnerships with professional associations in human resource development are being strengthened. Collaboration continues with USIA on areas of common interest and on ways to ensure the efficient use of resources. Other donors. Co-funding of training by non-USAID sources is higher than estimated previously. Donors such as the World Bank and the World Wildlife Fund often co-finance USAID training where there is an overlap of programs.

**US National Interests.** Training contributes to national security, playing a central role in international development, which leads to more stable societies. Improving individual skills, knowledge, and attitudes cuts across all sectors to provide more employment and income-generating options, greater access to health care and family planning resources, better informed broad-based participation in countries' democratic processes, greater tolerance for diversity, a more sustainable environmental foundation for global economic growth, and greater ability to deal with natural disasters. Economic prosperity for our increasingly export-driven economy is enhanced when ex-trainees affect decisions to purchase American products as a result of their exposure to US goods and services.

**Foreign Policy Strategies.** SSO3 activities give special emphasis to high priority countries. For example, technical assistance in training has targeted or will target El Salvador, Nicaragua, Haiti, Egypt, South Africa, Namibia, Ghana, Jordan, Indonesia, Mongolia, as well as Russia and all the ENI countries. Targeted human capacity development efforts in such countries satisfy a vital precondition to attaining both shorter- and longer-term foreign policy successes.

## **B. Expected Progress through Year 2000 and Management Actions**

FY97 was a year of building: TraiNet underwent extensive design improvement and testing, GTD received an unexpectedly high number of Mission buy-ins, and Missions using Best Practices integrated training portfolios more centrally into their strategic planning and management. This has set the stage for very positive results in FY98 and beyond.

### **1. Prospects for Achieving Targets**

Prospects improved dramatically following the completion of the ADS 253 training guidelines, which included "Best Practices". Coupled with the forthcoming deployment of the TraiNet database/management tool, G/HCD now has the capability to monitor, track and report on all facets of data related to participant training. With these fundamentals in place, prospects for high performance are much stronger than a year ago.

Missions now place greater emphasis on performance-based approaches to training, for greater impact. Externally verified data shows that many Missions are designing training programs with clear linkages to desired strategic results. They are involving stakeholders and partner institutions in analyzing organizational performance needs and identifying how training can be used to narrow performance gaps. Repeatedly Missions attribute their heightened awareness of reengineered training to G/HCD interventions.

### **2. Management Actions**

In 1996 G/HCD set an overly optimistic target for the number of Missions that would use TraiNet in FY97. Instead, the software system was tested at five Missions during the Fall of 1997, and a new release date of May 1998 established. Experience gained from these early adopter countries and from IRM's subsequent quality oversight role permitted further refinements in the system. These enhancements will simplify and accelerate the successful

installation of TraiNet in Missions and bureaus.

The SSO3 team will be exploring opportunities to use distance learning technologies to improve the impact and cost-effectiveness of Agency training efforts; continuing to promote "Best Practices"; exploring and promulgating cost containment strategies; deploying TraiNet; and pursuing enhanced partnerships with Peace Corps for cooperation between Volunteers and returning USAID trainees.

### 3. Results to be Achieved

For SSO3 overall, two SSO-level targets which showed results in excess of planned levels last year will be continued and further results attained.

**SSO3 Indicator 1: "Application of new skills to performance gaps."** A key component of "Best Practices" under re-engineering principles is to change perceptions and practices by Missions and their contractors to favor a performance approach to training needs analysis, and to shape planned activities to address identified performance gaps. The SSO3 team will continue to bring this message to the field.

**SSO3 Indicator 2: Decrease in the non-returnee rate.** More than 99 percent of the total training population returns home after the completion of individual training programs to contribute to the social and economic development of the participant's home country. We expect this high return rate to be maintained or improved.

**Intermediate Results.** G/HCD's two IRs for training, with eight anticipated results and indicators, were carefully planned. By the end of FY 2000 all are expected to reach completion levels that in the future will only require maintenance support - subject to the availability of necessary funds. We are applying more precise impact definitions derived from the reengineering framework that closely reflect Mission experience.

The growing shift to in-country and third country training creates a need for new cost saving approaches and raises issues of training quality control. Through the use of existing and new contracts, HCD will assist Missions to adapt innovative distance learning technologies as an option for not only lowering cost but also increasing accessibility of training and strengthening local institutions. Other cost control recommendations from our cost containment study, will guide Missions' and contractors' programmatic decisions.

Distance learning applications to USAID-sponsored training programs will allow economical and effective training modules to reach Missions and contractors, supplementing pre-departure preparations, and providing follow-on workshops or management training courses with no need for further travel. Using distance learning methods to upgrade the quality and reach of all in-country training institutions shows great promise.

TraiNet will enable Mission SO teams and activity managers to focus their training investments on reaching improved human performance in key partner institutions. USAID's shift to in-

country training suggests an entirely new approach for G/HCD in working with Missions, to help them raise host countries' local training institutions up to Best Practices standards of performance-oriented instruction.

#### **4. Prognosis for Achieving SSO**

G/HCD's leadership and fresh approaches for training have moved the Agency well along toward improving individual and organizational performance. Experience from early TraiNet adopters shows that the use of "Best Practices" is accelerated when TraiNet's framework is operational. G/HCD can foresee, by FY2000, reaching a performance level for general training systems requiring both maintenance-level effort, and a small additional amount for leadership tools to improve the quality of host-country training programs.

The distance learning and Peace Corps initiatives will provide long-lasting contributions to organizational performance improvements, and to developing host country capacity to deliver training. In establishing these forward-looking efforts, SSO3 is anticipating the challenge of sustaining training impact in transition and graduating countries when USAID staff are no longer present.

#### **C. Performance Data Tables (Beginning on next page)**

**D. Environmental Compliance.** SSO3 has no new Results Package for FY98, and so no new IIE will be required.



<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INDICATOR 3.0.1:</b> New training skills applied to fill identified work unit performance gaps			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Percent of returnees applying skills to fill identified work unit performance gaps	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCE:</b> Aguirre International and Global Training for Development Contractors; Academy for Educational Development, Development Associates, Institute for International Education, World Learning	1996	NA	NA
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> These data are obtained through questionnaires administered by Missions' monitoring and evaluation systems after an individual returns from training. The questionnaire typically asks a trainee to report whether he/she is able to apply the training on the job.  <b>COMMENTS:</b> <sup>1</sup> Application of skills by returnees to fill work performance gaps was reported by several Missions who conducted varying types of interviews or surveys. The results by region/ country are listed below.  “are doing their job better” (76%)— of returnees in ENI.  “I applied what I learned in my work” (85%)— returnees in the NIS Exchange and Training Project.  “successfully applied what they learned to influencing or making policy” (80%)— from Mongolia.  “using the skills, information and insights gained, on a regular basis” (88%)—of Egyptian returnees in the Decision Support Services Project.  Although the FY97 target was significantly exceeded, future targets are being retained pending availability of TraiNet data.	1997	25%	70–88% <sup>1</sup>
	1998	50%	
	1999	60%	
	2000	70%	
	2001	80%	
	2002		
	2003		

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INDICATOR 3.0.2:</b> Decrease in non-returnee rate (to be changed for FY98 to "High returnee rate maintained and improved.")			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Non-returnees as a percent of total trainees <b>SOURCE:</b> SSO3, IAP66A (visa) forms, and GTD Contractors <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> The “non-returnee rate” is defined as the number of individuals who completed their U.S.- based training, did not return home, and were reported to the INS by USAID for overstaying their visas, as a percentage of the total number of individuals trained in the U.S. during FY97. <b>COMMENTS:</b> <sup>1</sup> The five percent reported in 1996 was based on the more narrow definition of “non-returnee,” which was dependent on unrealistically close monitoring in the field.  <sup>2</sup> In FY97, 39 individuals were reported to the INS for not returning to their country. The total number of participants in U.S.-based training in FY97 was 6,362.  <sup>3</sup> Beginning in 1998, the indicator will be stated as “high returnee rate maintained and improved.” The numbers reported will be trainees who returned as a percent of total trainees. The percent of non-returnees can fluctuate in a given year because of unstable political conditions which are beyond USAID's control, as was the case in 1995 when the number of non-returnees increased due to political unrest in Somalia, Rwanda, and Haiti, for example. However, as a point of comparison, the non-returnee rate in 1994 was approximately .59%. A total of 102 individuals were reported to INS from a total of 17,112 participants in US based training in 1994.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	NA	5.0% <sup>1</sup>
	1997	5.0%	0.6% <sup>2</sup>
	1998	99.5% <sup>3</sup>	
	1999	99.5%	
	2000	99.5%	
	2001		
	2002		
	2003		

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country institutions			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.1:</b> USAID training policy and practice improved			
<b>INDICATOR 3.1.1:</b> Policies lead to performance changes			
<p><b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of trainee-stakeholder agreements defining training purposes and responsibilities entered into</p> <hr/> <p><b>SOURCE:</b> Global Training for Development Contractors: Academy for Educational Development, Development Associates, Institute for International Education, World Learning.</p> <hr/> <p><b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> In 1997, the revised ADS 253 defined the stakeholder agreement as “a written statement between participants and other stakeholders specifying agreed-to performance targets within the organizational setting of the participants selected”. Stakeholder agreements are now an integral part of strategic planning for training. Execution of the agreement with all partners involved is a major step to improving the quality of the training, as it is considered an essential step in the performance gap analysis. SO teams are expected to work with trainees and their supervisors within the partner institutions to produce agreed upon statements of expectations as to how training will be used.</p> <hr/> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b> <sup>1</sup>In FY97, the planned number of stakeholder agreements was 10 as it was expected that only long-term trainees would be using agreements. In fact, the use of stakeholder agreements was implemented for many short-term trainees as well.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> 390 of 664 participants in the GTD-Transit-Europe training program, (World Learning, Inc.) had Training Agreements on file. Exempted from Training Agreements were 84 Macedonian participants and 190 Bosnian participants. AED reported that all trainees in Russia and the NIS (1933) signed stakeholder agreements with USAID, but these were defined more narrowly as “a formal agreement between USAID and the trainee.” Approximately 50 percent of the agreements (966) are considered to be the expanded version as described in ADS 253.</p> <p>The use of TraiNet will provide uniform data on the use of stakeholder agreements. This will allow a reassessment of the target for FY 2000.</p>	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	NA	NA
	1997	10 <sup>1</sup>	1,356 <sup>2</sup>
	1998	15%	
	1999	25%	
	2000	<sup>3</sup>	
	2001		
	2002		
	2003		

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.1:</b> USAID training policy and practice improved			
<b>INDICATOR 3.1.2:</b> Training programs designed and implemented using Best Practices <sup>1</sup>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of Strategic Objective Teams using Best Practices <b>SOURCE:</b> Aguirre International Survey of 15 Missions; G/HCD e-mail survey to selected Missions <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> G/HCD intended to influence the use of three Best Practices in FY97, through technical assistance visits, publications, the annual conference, and on-going communication with Missions.  <sup>1</sup> The three practices were a) the strategic use of training, b) expanded stakeholder agreements, and c) follow-up activities. Specifically, a) training programs designed with clear causal linkages to Missions' SOs; b) stakeholders actively involved in selection, clarification of goal of training to improve organizational performance; c) follow-up support fosters application of training. <b>COMMENTS:</b>  <sup>2</sup> A survey by Aguirre International in March 1998 of 15 countries revealed that, over and above the 60 SO teams reported for FY96, an additional 37 SO teams reported using Best Practices. Also, two additional countries, Philippines (6) and Mongolia (4) reported the use of Best Practices by all SO teams (10 SO teams). Eighteen more SO teams are using Best Practices in Africa, according to the ATLAS program manager.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	60	80
	1997	150	145 <sup>2</sup>
	1998	200	
	1999	250	
	2000	All	
	2001	All	
	2002		
	2003		

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.1: USAID training policy and practice improved			
INDICATOR 3.1.3: Number of buyins for distance learning feasibility studies			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of Missions buying in to SSO3/LearnLink feasibility studies; cumulative  SOURCE: TraiNet, surveys  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: This indicator measures buyins to SSO3/LearnLink activity for local distance learning feasibility study.  COMMENTS:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1998	1	
	1999	3	
	2000	6	
	2001	9	
	2002	TBD	
	2003	TBD	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.1: USAID training policy and practice improved			
INDICATOR 3.1.4: Number of buyins for distance learning access and application			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of Missions buying in to SSO3/LearnLink establishment of distance learning access and application; cumulative  SOURCE: TraiNet, surveys  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: This indicator measures buyins to SSO3/LearnLink activity for full-scale distance learning access and application.  COMMENTS:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1998	0	
	1999	1	
	2000	2	
	2001	3	
	2002	TBD	
	2003	TBD	

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.2:</b> Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID training			
<b>INDICATOR 3.2.1:</b> GTD programming mechanism meets Mission needs <sup>1</sup>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of buy-ins; cumulative  <b>SOURCE:</b> Tracking Report of Mission/Bureau Buy-ins to GTD, SSO3, USAID/G/HCD, January 27, 1998.  <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> A buy-in is defined as a contract from a USAID Mission with one of the 5 GTD contractors.  <b>COMMENTS:</b> <sup>1</sup> The number of buy-ins will fluctuate in a given year, based on the resources and needs of the Missions. (Most buy-ins are valid for more than one year.)	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	0	2
	1997	15	47
	1998	30	
	1999	45	
	2000	60	
	2001	TBD	
	2002		
	2003		

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country institutions			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.2:</b> Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID training			
<b>INDICATOR 3.2.2:</b> Increased cost-sharing by stakeholders and partners in USAID-sponsored training			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Aggregate cost-sharing as percent of total program cost	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCE:</b> ADS 253			
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Total program costs is the average monthly cost of technical or academic programs multiplied by the number of actual participant training months completed in each category. ADS 253 defines cost-sharing as “...financial or in-kind support from counterpart or non-governmental organizations to the benefit of a participant or training program.”	1996	NA	45% <sup>1</sup>
	1997	5%	45% <sup>1</sup>
<b>COMMENTS:</b> <sup>1</sup> “The USAID guideline for host-country contributions to USAID-funded projects is 25 percent. The actual percentage may vary widely across activities. G/HCD data provided in 1997 for USIA’s annual report to Congress, <i>International Exchange and Training Activities of the U.S. Government</i> , show a 25% host-government and 20% private-sector contribution, on average. This is consistent with data from Georgetown University's Center for International Education and Development (CIED), which managed over 1,100 participants in 1996, indicating approximately 20% cost-sharing by the private sector.	1998	10% <sup>2</sup>	
	1999	15%	
	2000	20%	
	2001	25%	
	2002		
<sup>2</sup> G/HCD has commissioned a cost containment study in FY98 which will look at this indicator in greater depth.			

<b>STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
<b>APPROVED:</b> DD/MMM/YYYY		<b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> G/HCD	
<b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.2:</b> Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID training			
<b>INDICATOR 3.2.3:</b> Number of Missions using TraiNet			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of Missions using TraiNet; cumulative  <b>SOURCE:</b> Tracking Report of Mission/Bureau Buy-ins to GTD, SSO3, January 27, 1998.  <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> TraiNet (Training Results and Information Network) is a performance monitoring software tool which will allow Agency management to track trainee information and cost information. TraiNet will permit the tracking of USAID's training programs worldwide.  <b>COMMENTS:</b> Five countries were selected in May 1997 as early adopters of TraiNet: Bulgaria, Egypt, Madagascar, Namibia, and South Africa. Extensive testing and refinement by IRM to assure compatibility with NMS delayed final approval and deployment. TraiNet is expected to be fully approved and released in May 1998.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1996	5	0
	1997	15	5 <sup>1</sup>
	1998	30	
	1999	60	
	2000	All	
	2001	All	
	2002		
	2003		



PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 3: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations			
APPROVED: DD/MMM/YYYY		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.2: System improvements increase the impact and cost effectiveness of USAID training.			
INDICATOR 3.2.4: Use of G/HCD interagency collaborative mechanisms			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of Missions buying in to interagency mechanisms; cumulative  SOURCE: Interagency agreement documents  INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: This indicator measures buyins to G/HCD agreements with other U.S. agencies, such as Peace Corps.  COMMENTS:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1998	1	
	1999	4	
	2000	8	
	2001	12	
	2002	15	
	2001	TBD	
	2002		
	2003		

---

**Sp01>SSO4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services****A. Performance Analysis****1. Progress During Past Year****Sp01 (current): Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services.****SSO4 (proposed): Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services.**

Special Objective 1 (Sp01) was established at the conclusion of the FY99 R4 review, reflecting a consensus that the proposed area of involvement would initially be a pilot or exploratory effort. As G/HCD reengineered during FY97, and we considered our comparative advantage and manageable interests, we decided the Objective should be defined more narrowly and adjusted to build on complementary G/HCD core program strengths. These decisions, coupled with the long-term importance of information access to G/HCD's human capacity development objectives, now lead the Center to seek approval for replacing Sp01 with SSO4. In this R4, performance analysis will be discussed in terms of Sp01; expected progress through the year 2000 in terms of SSO4. Progress, trends and policy interests described under the performance analysis pertain to Sp01 and SSO4.

Access to information through policy reform and information technology applications is essential for all emerging education and training systems and is a fundamental requirement for broad-based participation in sustainable development. The primary purposes of SSO4 are (1) to create the enabling conditions (policy and institutional) for the expansion of access to information and (2) to demonstrate innovative information technology applications serving development objectives. This combination of policy and institutional reform, along with the demonstration of information technology, can be particularly effective in promoting access to the means of communication for the developing world's under-served majorities.

**Sp01: Performance Indicators.** In the R4 for FY99, three SpO-level indicators were proposed which pertain to telecommunications infrastructure (number of lines and traffic volume, pricing, and service to poor communities). Results under these indicators were not planned until the year 2000. Apart from providing no useful measure of performance, these indicators will be discontinued because they are too removed from the circumstances of USAID direct interventions, they are subject to secular trends beyond USAID's ability to control or monitor, and they are far beyond G/HCD's manageable interest.

**Sp01, IR1: Policy, law and regulatory reforms adopted to allow improved, expanded, and more affordable telecommunications services.** The FY99 R4 stated: "In 1997 we will establish an interagency agreement to work with the FCC, NTIA and State to implement the policy assistance component of the SO." This agreement with the State Department is now in place. Activities are being initiated through G/HCD staff in collaboration with the FCC and Department of Commerce to assist telecommunications policy and regulatory reform in five

countries. The performance indicator is the number of target countries adopting reforms, and none were planned until FY98 because the activity was new.

In addition, the management contract resulting from the FY99 R4 required G/HCD to develop a report summarizing G Bureau activities related to telecommunications policy and information technology applications. G/HCD convened an ad hoc working group with representation from all G Centers and WID for this purpose. Each Center/Office presented their activities in the telecommunication/information technology area. A summary of the results of this review is undergoing clearance at this time and will form the basis of a report to AA/G on information technology activities in the Global Bureau.

**Sp01, IR2: Improved capacity of key institutions to expand or improve telecommunications services.** Telecommunications providers, regulators and policy makers must be knowledgeable about both the rapidly evolving technologies and related policy and regulatory approaches. Institutions to be assisted through training include telecommunications ministries, regulatory authorities, Post, Telegraph and Telephone (PTT) entities and other telecommunications service providers. G/HCD implements this training largely through an on-going grant to the US Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI). USTTI annually trains more than 400 telecommunications and broadcast professionals from approximately 158 countries using the facilities of about 70 telecommunications companies, universities and federal agencies. During FY97 USTTI trained 80 host-country participants with G/HCD funding (50 were planned), and approximately \$50,000 of G/HCD funding contributed to the overall USTTI operation. The performance indicator for this IR is the number of trained professionals providing institutions with improved capacity.

**Sp01, IR3: Innovative practices and technologies implemented to expand and improve telecommunications services.** This IR addresses the implementation of innovative practices and technologies that offer expanded and improved telecommunications services, particularly those that impact development objectives and would not otherwise be forthcoming from the private sector alone. The FY99 R4 includes no indicator or expected results for this IR, anticipating their development during FY97.

## **2. Explicit Performance Rating**

Sp01 exceeded its targets during FY97, although these were modest. Only IR2 projected results under an indicator, the number of telecommunications professionals trained, and these results were exceeded: training was planned for 50 professionals; 80 were trained. IR1 met its planned target of finalizing an inter-agency agreement, and IR3 planned and initiated a portfolio of applications which will be discussed below under expected progress.

## **3. Explanation of Results**

Sp01 represents the beginning of a new era of intervention for USAID. Along with the Leland Initiative, select work by the EGAD, ENV and PHN Centers and a variety of Mission activities, this objective puts the Agency on the information highway, joining historic social and economic

movements toward a new information society led by the emerging information economy. USAID-assisted countries must not be left behind by this transformation; they must use it to overcome longstanding constraints to development.

The activities developed during FY97 through Sp01 lay the foundation for the Agency's response to this challenge. Support for national information and telecommunications policy reform, related institution strengthening, and the demonstration of innovations using information technologies provide a modestly priced package of interventions that can help launch USAID-assisted countries into the information millennium. Plans for policy reform assistance are underway in over 5 countries; USTTI received more than 1,100 applications for training during FY97, a trend that keeps increasing and will lead to the eventual transformation of information agencies and regulatory bodies; plans for Internet-assisted community information and learning centers, new forms of distance education and have been developed. While the targets for Sp01 were modest, the implication of achieving them, as has been done, is great.

#### **4. Policy Interests**

**Agency Emphasis Areas.** Sp01 activities are not gender specific, but they expand opportunities for women by broadening access to information for entire populations. All activities are implemented in collaboration with our main customers, the Regional Bureaus and Missions, typically at their request and in response to specific needs. The broader foreign assistance community is often involved in planning and implementing activities, particularly those initiated under our Inter-Agency Agreement with the State Department, and regular information exchange meetings are held with the World Bank. The Federal Communications Commission, Commerce and the Office of the US Trade Representative also participate. G/HCD's new partnership with FCC, Commerce, State, and the US Trade Representative is substantially supportive of Vice President Gore's vision for a streamlined and more productive executive branch.

**US National Interests.** The free flow of information and worldwide access to information and the means of communication have a direct impact on strengthening democratic movements and opening markets around the world. They are also essential to achieving sustainable development and preventing crises. Sp01 will support these broad US interests in USAID-assisted countries. This will increase demand for US goods and services related to the information technologies including telecommunications equipment and computer hardware and software. It will be easier for these countries to work with US firms and US companies will be able to offer services because of a liberalized policy and regulatory environments. Finally, as countries liberalize (and as significant numbers of telecommunications professionals have attended USTTI courses), they increasingly become supporters of US positions in international fora such as the ITU, GATT and WARC. In recent years, scores of international delegations have been led by USTTI graduates, a "fund of good will" that enhances US leverage in international regulatory debates.

**Foreign Policy Strategies.** The activities of Sp01 include major interventions in Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti and Paraguay -- countries singled out as important to US foreign policy objectives in recent Presidential or State Department statements. In addition, as is generally accepted since the FAX machine revolution of Tienanmen Square, classes of beneficiaries stated

to be important in US foreign policy terms, such as those under threat by human rights violations, the disenfranchised struggling to implement democracy, refugees in need of basic services, and minority populations of indigenous peoples. These groups gain significant help through access to the information technologies which Sp01 supports.

## **B. Expected Progress through FY 2000 and Management Actions**

### **1. Prospects for Achieving Targets**

#### **SSO4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services.**

Strategic Support Objective 4 (SSO4) changes the formulation of Sp01 to emphasize the end user in terms of “access” and to make explicit the important synergy between policy reform and the demonstration of applications. At USAID/Haiti, the Mission Director believes that this combination of policy and application assistance provides leverage which enhances the effectiveness of each activity if it were undertaken alone.

By elevating Sp01 to SSO4, G/HCD is also acknowledging the long-term nature of its effort. SSO4 is part of on-going work under the new Agency human capacity development and training goal. It will be decades before USAID has completed its potential task of assisting host countries with information policies and technologies for development.

Overall, because the secular trend toward an information society is so strong, because US economic interests have so much at stake, and because it is high on the US political agenda, assistance in the information technology and telecommunications arena has every promise of success. The demand among our customers (host country beneficiaries) is there; our partners and stakeholders are fully on board. The cost to USAID, since the Agency is not in the business of providing infrastructure, is extremely modest. The interventions proposed under the three SSO4 IR's are potentially effective, feasible and within G/HCD's manageable interest. The results are stated at annual levels commensurate with SSO4's foreseeable resources: two countries introduce reform; two institutions significantly expand or improve information technology or telecommunications services; two institutions adopt information technology innovative applications.

**IR4.1: Policy, law and regulatory reforms adopted to allow improved and more affordable telecommunications services.** At this writing, the interagency agreement with the Department of State is about to send policy missions to Ghana, Kenya, and Guinea Bissau, involving expertise from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the Department of Commerce and the Office of the US Trade Representative. Under the agreement, an FCC workshop in Washington, D.C. for host country regulators has taken place, and a telecommunications policy educational program is being established in a regional training institute in Nairobi, Kenya. The agreement is also facilitating the involvement of USAID-assisted countries in World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations. Finally, G/HCD staff themselves are engaged with telecommunications policy assessment missions to Guatemala and Haiti. Achievement of the target for this IR is highly likely.

**IR4.2: Improved capacity of key institutions to expand or improve information technology and telecommunications services.** G/HCD works toward this result by training professional staff of key policy-making and regulatory institutions. The training is typically conducted at the US Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI) which annually trains more than 400 telecommunications and broadcast professionals from approximately 158 countries using the facilities of about 70 telecommunications companies, universities and federal agencies. Over a thousand professional applicants vie for about four hundred places, helping to ensure that only the trainees with the most potential to influence their institutions are accepted. The prognosis for success is high.

**IR4.3: Increased application of information technology and telecommunications services to achieve development objectives.** As the use of information technologies explodes, innovative application models are emerging. These include community learning and information centers, computer-assisted learning at teacher training institutes and nodal schools, school-to-school partnerships, networks of NGOs to support regional objectives, networks of universities and researchers to solve regional and global development problems, distance education through the Internet, and the introduction of Virtual University approaches that will use technology to strengthen and gain added impact from USAID training activities. These models involve clusters of technologies and require a package of “tools” for their successful implementation, such as assessment tools, guidelines from past experience to shape the intervention and tools for monitoring impact. These “models of use” are operational foci for demonstrating the power of the emerging technologies, and work at the demand side of the access problem, complementing policy interventions. G/HCD uses its own staff and the resources of its Global Communication and Learning Systems (LearnLink) activity to plan and implement these “models of use.”

This IR has an excellent prognosis for success since implementation for several “models of use” are underway. Municipal community information and learning centers in Asuncion, Paraguay (for instance) have already been inaugurated in early FY98 with the help of FY97 JAIF funding.

## **2. Management Actions**

Four management actions are required to assist this effort: two internal to the Global Bureau; two which pertain to Agency-wide issues. First, SpO1 should be replaced by SSO4 to reflect the continuing significance of information technologies in international development. Second, minimal but adequate funding must be given to SSO4 to pursue the three complementary IRs outlined above.

Beyond this, the Agency needs to do more than recognize this sector as a cross-cutting theme and as an emphasis element within the human capacity development goal. The Agency should establish emphasis codes, performance goals and indicators for information policy and technology so that Mission investments are legitimated and their impact tracked.

The Agency must also consider how to maximize its use of the new information technologies to help with regional and global development problems. At the present time, US partners must

typically knock on the doors of multiple USAID Missions to seek funding for implementing a global distance learning intervention, a regional epidemiological tracking program or a worldwide institutional networking strategy. Should there be some new USAID institutional mechanism to mirror the transcendent power of the new information technologies?

### **3. Results to be Achieved**

In implementing SSO4, G/HCD will contribute to changing the way business is done in development, just as US society has changed in the face of the information technologies. Results will be broader and more profound than our indicators can capture. G/HCD accordingly will develop a series of case histories to describe the broader change it anticipates in education, training, democracy and economic growth. For example, if the community information centers in Paraguay expand and if the centers in Haiti are implemented, G/HCD expects to see dramatic local impact on democratic participation, governance, the availability of educational materials and private sector investment.

### **4. Prognosis for Achieving SS0**

G/HCD has implementation instruments in place for SSO4 to achieve these results: an inter-agency agreement with State; the USTTI grant; an applications IQC, LearnLink; and RSSA and AAAS agreements to provide technical staff. Productive relationships with the other G/HCD SSOs are underway. The climate in the Agency is right. The results promised are feasible within the resources presently available to SSO4 during FY98 and projected for FY99 and FY 2000. Given the modest resources requested, the overall prognosis for achieving SSO4 is excellent.

**C. Performance Tables** (Beginning on next page)

**D. Environmental Compliance.** No new IEE will be required.

TO BE ELIMINATED			
SPECIAL OBJECTIVE 1: Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.1: Number of target countries achieving goals for number of lines and traffic volume			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE:	1996	NA	NA
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1997	0	
COMMENTS:	1998	0	
	1999	0	
	2000	3	
	2001	6	

TO BE ELIMINATED			
SPECIAL OBJECTIVE 1: Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.2: Number of target countries achieving goals for service pricing			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE:	1996	NA	NA
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1997	0	
COMMENTS:	1998	0	
	1999	0	
	2000	3	
	2001	6	



TO BE ELIMINATED			
SPECIAL OBJECTIVE 1: Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 1.0.3: Number of target countries achieving goals for rural or poor communities served			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE:	1996	NA	NA
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1997	0	
COMMENTS:	1998	0	
	1999	0	
	2000	3	
	2001	6	

TO BE ELIMINATED			
SPECIAL OBJECTIVE 1: Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 5.1: Policy, law and regulatory reforms adopted to allow improved, expanded and more affordable telecommunications services.			
INDICATOR 5.1.1: Number of target countries adopting reforms			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE:	1996	NA	NA
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1997	0	
COMMENTS:	1998	3	
	1999	6	
	2000	9	
	2001	12	

TO BE ELIMINATED			
SPECIAL OBJECTIVE 1: Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 5.2: Improved capacity of key institutions to expand or improve telecommunications services			
INDICATOR 5.2.1: Trained professionals provide institutions with improved capacity			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of professionals trained	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Telephone conversation with USTTI Director	1996	40	62
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: This is the number of trainees who attended USTTI-sponsored training in calendar year 1997. The courses are short-term, highly technical programs designed for communications professionals.	1997	50	80
	1998	100	
	1999	150	
	2000	200	
COMMENTS: Training programs at USTTI are conducted in trimesters, which ran as follows: April 10-July 4, 1997; July 10-October 7, 1997; September 11-November 14, 1997	2001	250	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 4.0.1: Countries introducing policy or regulatory reform			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Numbers of countries per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID Missions and partner institutions	1997	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Countries are counted if they are judged by USAID or partner institutions to have taken steps to introduce reform, such as new laws, privatization of services or new measures for spectrum management.	1998	1	
	1999	2	
	2000	2	
	2001	2	
COMMENTS:			

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 4.0.2: Institutions expanding or improving services			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of institutions per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID staff and partner agency reports	1997	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Institutions are counted if they are judged by USAID or partner institutions to have expanded or improved information technology or telecommunications services to portions of the population underserved	1998	1	
	1999	2	
	2000	2	
	2001	2	
COMMENTS:			

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INDICATOR 4.0.3: Institutions adopting information technology "models of use"			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of institutions per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID staff and contractor reports	1997	0	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Institutions are counted if they are judged by USAID to have adopted models which impact populations underserved.	1998	2	
	1999	2	
	2000	2	
	2001	2	
COMMENTS:			

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.1: Policy, law and regulatory reforms adopted to allow improved and more affordable telecommunications services			
INDICATOR 4.1.1: Direct technical assistance to host countries on policy reform			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of missions by experts	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: G/HCD and contractor staff	1997	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1998	3	
COMMENTS:	1999	3	
	2000	3	
	2001	3	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.1: Policy, law and regulatory reforms adopted to allow improved and more affordable telecommunications services			
INDICATOR 4.1.2: Participation in international fora that influence telecommunications policy reform			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of countries participating	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID and partner institutions	1997	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Countries are counted if their participation is judged by USAID or partner institutions to support significant and appropriate policy or regulatory reform.	1998	1	
	1999	2	
	2000	2	
COMMENTS:	2001	2	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.2: Improved capacity of key institutions to expand and improve information technology and telecommunications services.			
INDICATOR 4.2.1: Key developing country personnel trained			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number trained per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USTTI	1997	50	80
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1998	75	
COMMENTS:	1999	75	
	2000	75	
	2001	75	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.2: Improved capacity of key institutions to expand and improve information technology and telecommunications services.			
INDICATOR 4.2.2: Number of workshops and/or courses for current and future telecommunications regulators developed			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of workshops and/or courses per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	0	0
	1998	2	
	1999	2	
	2000	2	
	2001	2	
SOURCE: G/HCD			
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:			
COMMENTS:			

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.3: Increased application of information technology and telecommunications services to achieve development objectives.			
INDICATOR 4.3.1: Direct technical assistance to Missions in application of information technology			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of Missions per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: G/HCD and contractor staff reports	1997	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1998	5	
COMMENTS:	1999	5	
	2000	5	
	2001	5	

PROPOSED			
STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE 4: Expanded access to and application of information and telecommunications services			
APPROVED:		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD	
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.3: Increased application of information technology and telecommunications services to achieve development objectives.			
INDICATOR 4.3.2: Information technology "models of use" developed and assisted within USAID programs			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of models developed and assisted per year	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID and contractor reports	1997	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: An application is counted as having been developed and assisted if it is judged by USAID Missions to play a significant role in pursuing its strategic objectives	1998	2	
	1999	2	
	2000	2	
COMMENTS:	2001	2	

---

### Part III. Status of Management Contract

#### A. Introduction

G/HCD's management contract was substantially changed in the FY99 R4 review, establishing:

- \*SSO1 for Basic Education
- \*SSO2 for Higher Education (to include workforce development)
- \*SSO3 for Training
- \*Special Objective 1 for telecommunications

In addition, G/HCD was tasked (a) to prepare a new Strategic Plan providing context for the new SSO structure (b) to coordinate a Bureau-wide review of telecommunications activities and report on that in the FY2000 R4 (c) to prepare a performance monitoring plan and (d) to provide information on environmental compliance.

#### B. Status

**G/HCD Strategic Plan.** This document has been completed in draft form. Review has been postponed pending the outcome of the Agency's ongoing assessment of the Goal for Human Capacity Development. When the Agency assessment is completed, G/HCD will make any necessary adjustments to the draft Strategic Plan and initiate the internal and external review process.

**Telecommunications Review.** This review has been completed. The outcome is briefly noted in this R4 within the SpO1 discussion. A summary of findings, implications, and recommendations is under preparation, and will be provided to AA/G after discussion with other G Bureau Center/Office Directors.

**Performance Monitoring Plan.** As a formal program document, this item must await finalization of the G/HCD Strategic Plan. However, G/HCD addressed the need for reliable performance information during FY97 in a practical way by arranging for an independent outside contractor to collect performance information. The information assembled by the contractor has been used in the FY2000 R4. A complete report including information on methodology and data reliability is available separately.

**Environmental Compliance.** This information for FY96 is provided as an annex to the FY2000 R4. The FY97 information is presented for each Objective within the body of the FY2000 R4.

#### C. Adjustments Proposed

G/HCD proposes one major and one limited adjustment to the Management Contract. First, we wish SpO1 to be redefined as SSO4, with concomitant changes to the performance indicators and Intermediate Results (IRs). Second, we wish to refine our statement of SSO1 (basic education), with concomitant adjustments to SSO-level performance indicators and to IRs.

## 1. SpO1 > SSO4

From a management contract perspective, the issue is manageable interest. As initially defined, the SpO1 was "to create the enabling conditions for the expansion of telecommunications services and their greater affordability." During the G Bureau-wide telecommunications review process over the past year, G/HCD has explicitly considered where our comparative advantage lies in the broad and ever-expanding area of information policy and information technology, including telecommunications. The original SpO1 language is at once too broad and too narrow. Too broad, because it encompasses aspects of telecommunication sector action (eg service provision) that are beyond G/HCD's manageable interests -- and too narrow, because the current formulation leaves out important synergies with information policy, training, and technology applications that are clearly within our manageable interest. Thus the redefined SSO4, presented in this R4, focuses carefully on policy, training, and application issues that lie within G/HCD's manageable interests. These are issues which will assume ever-growing salience as the information revolution broadens in the developing world.

Nonetheless, G Bureau has continuing and broader interests in this arena, and G/HCD is dialoguing with G/EGAD and other centers to identify collaborative management approaches to these broader and still-emerging programmatic interests. Our suggestions, refined after discussion with other centers, will be presented to AA/G in the telecommunications review report identified above.

## 2. SSO1

Again the issue is manageable interest. The initial definition of G/HCD's basic education objective was cast at a high level that is essentially no different than the basic education objective as stated in the overall Agency human capacity development Goal. By redefining our SSO1 as laid out in the R4, G/HCD will be able to provide far more useful measures of performance, clarify the ways in which our program contributes to the Agency Goal, and pursue a program fully consistent with our financial and staff resources.



## IV. Resource Request

### A. Financial Plan

#### 1. Resource Levels

**Introduction.** The Center for Human Capacity Development provides global programs, technical leadership, field support services and mechanisms, professional training, and applied research for regional bureaus and missions to develop innovative, high quality and cost-effective programs in this sector. Given its global mandate and leadership role, the Center's strategic programs must help guide Agency activities, while also providing timely, high impact technical support. For these reasons, the Center has developed a careful plan of carefully focused results packages for leadership in human capacity development.

Every effort has been made to be both cost-effective and innovative in order to minimize the need for central resources. Missions are encouraged to buy in to G/HCD's mechanisms and to use the tools, lessons learned and best practices culled from the Center's investments, and especially those developed during the past three years.

A total of \$11,775,000 is requested for FY 2000 to ensure Agency leadership in human capacity development. This is a conservative request in light of the many demands upon the Center's staff and programming capacity. The Center receives approximately \$7 for each \$1 of core funding, and it must maximize on core resources. Although the FY99 CP lists only \$7,870,000 for G/HCD, the original request was for \$12,400,000. It is important to note that the Center received \$12,363,000 in FY 1997. Thus, the request for \$11,775,000 in FY 2000 is in line with past core support.

**Basic Education.** G/HCD requests a total of \$4.7 million for this high-performing, priority area of human capacity development. This funding level will ensure the provision of minimally adequate core funds (\$3.2 million) for three key field support mechanisms that ensure the Center will achieve its targets for expanding and improving the quality of basic education. These mechanisms receive high service demand from field missions: Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL2); Improving Educational Quality (IEQ2), and Global Communications and Learning Systems (LearnLink).

In addition, we will consolidate and expand one major leadership activity that will be initiated in FY99. In response to global needs for participatory education sector appraisals, the activity for Policy Leadership in Education (PLE) will receive \$1.5 million to provide technical guidance and tools for educational policy dialogue and appraisals. Many nations with major educational needs lack up-to-date, systemic and comprehensive policy reviews for educational development. Policy appraisals will feature policy dialogue at all levels and active participation on the part of representatives of both the public and private sectors. Depending upon the interests and requests of missions and regional bureaus, these appraisals, policy dialogues, program designing and networking activities will focus on:

- \* Planning for meeting the strains of rapidly expanding basic education systems
- \* Ensuring quality primary and secondary education for girls as well as boys
- \* Meeting the education planning and program needs of crisis/transition nations
- \* Identifying networks and programs for early childhood development
- \* Linking resources for basic education with higher education/workforce

**Higher Education and Workforce Development.** For higher education and workforce development, a total budget of \$4 million is requested. Within that sum, \$2 million will be needed as a minimal contribution to the Cooperative Agreement with the Association Liaison Office (ALO), \$1 million for the maintenance of the HBCU Higher Education Partnerships Program, and \$400,000 for final UDLP-related activities.

In addition, in light of the Agency Third Goal for education and training, and the new emphasis upon higher education, the Center proposes to establish the Transformation of Higher Education Activity (THEA) for \$600,000. This activity will provide technical assistance to nations and their higher education systems and regional networks with regard to improving the linking of higher education to development, diversifying sources of income, improving university teaching and administration, and building public/private partnerships for improved employment and productivity.

**Training.** A total of \$1,175,000 is requested for providing Agency support to US participant, third country and in-country training. Of this sum, \$775,000 will be devoted to ensure the full utilization of TrainNet, and for helping missions to design and develop quality training programs to meet the needs of their SOs.

In addition, a new activity Quality Training Support (QTS) will be initiated for \$400,000. This new mechanism will permit missions to buy in for the purpose of providing skilled technical advice to national institutions. QTS will assist them to improve the quality of their in-country training programs. Because over 1.5 million persons are trained annually through USAID-assisted programs, a special effort is required to help ensure the quality and long-term maintenance of these in-country training programs.

**Information Technologies and Telecommunications.** Information technologies and telecommunications are leading growth areas for USAID. For this reason, we are requesting an increased budget of \$1.9 million to meet needs for leadership, training, policy development and innovation. The Center will continue to support USTTI at the level of \$500,000, and key activities for mission support and inter-agency collaborations under Information Policy Leadership will require another \$500,000.

In addition, a new program for the USAID Virtual University and Innovations in Distance Learning (UVU) will require \$1 million for a results package that will include a feasibility study, as well as program design, quality assurance, pilot and evaluation activities. We expect the UVU to be of considerable interest to university leaders in developing nations, and it may also attract foundation support. Distance training may well become the leading form of Agency training, and under this activity, special attention will be placed on transmitting the latest and

best in distance learning techniques and systems to our field missions.

## **B. Prioritization of Objectives**

All strategic support objectives in the Center are essential parts of the Agency's human capacity development sector. As a result, it is exceedingly difficult to prioritize them. This prioritization is offered with the realization that the Center cannot discard any one its SSO areas without negatively affecting the Agency as a whole.

### **Priority 1: SSO1, Basic Education**

It is clear that primary emphasis in the Agency and in the Center is placed upon ensuring the expansion and quality of basic education. Providing leadership and quality backstopping for Agency programs under the basic education directive is an essential role of the Center.

### **Priority 2: SSO2, Higher Education and Workforce Development**

Higher education is essential to the improvement of the education sector as a whole, and the transformation of higher education for achieving development goals has become the secondary focus of the Center. Agency directives and Administration priorities in higher education must be met creatively. In addition, Third Goal directives focus on the role of higher education for sustainable development.

### **Priority 3: SSO4, Information Technologies and Telecommunications**

Although new to USAID, information technologies and telecommunications policy and applications rapidly are becoming a major Agency focus. This area bridges basic and higher education, workforce development and training, and as such it is becoming increasingly essential to the provision of quality learning opportunities world-wide. The highly cost-effective USTTI program is also an Agency directive.

### **Priority 4: SSO3, Training**

Central activities for training improvement and policy guidance are essential for USAID's strategic objective teams in all missions and bureaus, as well as for meeting certain federal requirements. G/HCD seeks to focus on improving training quality and institutional training capacity, as well as on utilizing distance training techniques for lowering costs while enhancing learning outcomes and performance.

## **C. Workforce and OE Requirements**

**OE Workforce.** G/HCD's OE workforce has shrunk from 32 FTE in FY96 to 17 FTE plus 2 WAE in FY97 to 16 permitted "bodies on board" in FY98. Although FY97 has been a year of substantial achievement, it came at a cost in worktime and stress that cannot be sustained. We propose to address this radical erosion in capacity as follows:

- \* Basic Education. To maintain technical leadership we wish to increase the USDH staff of SSO1 from the current three persons to five, beginning in FY99. One position we will obtain internally. Rather than seek a replacement for our junior secretary who is moving onward, we will use this opportunity to recruit a policy expert in basic education. This person will provide leadership for a new generation of policy-based education activities in FY99 and beyond. In addition, we wish to add a monitoring and evaluation specialist to the SSO1 team to increase our ability to learn from experience in creating new generation programs.
- \* Higher Education. Beginning in FY99 we are requesting an additional USDH for the SSO2 team, raising it from two USDH to three USDH. The new team member, with a focus on financial leveraging in higher education, will provide the Higher Education team with great professional breadth and a minimal critical mass required to maintain technical leadership (consistent with the status of Higher Education as an Agency Objective within the 3rd Goal).

**Program Workforce.** We are proposing a small increase of two persons in the program-funded workforce. This will consist of a TAACS advisor for the Basic Education team, focusing on field program liaison and support, and a RSSA or TAACS advisor for the Information team, focusing on computer-assisted learning and Internet technologies in international development. These additions to our staff fill critical functional gaps.

**Fellows.** The new Higher Education Fellows program has already been approved with a ceiling of one Fellow. We will recruit this individual in FY98 and the person will be on board in FY99 and thereafter. This increases our in-house Fellow level from two to three. The other two Fellow positions are AAAS Fellows.

**Travel.** We consistently have requests for travel totalling twice or more of our allowance. The fact is, USAID as a decentralized organization perhaps underinvests in physical communications. We wish to increase our travel budget by \$35,000 per year above the straightlined level of \$85,900. Our travel is primarily for donor coordination, for planning program innovations, and for assessing progress on-site. We ask that Missions meet at least 50 percent and usually 100 percent of field service travel.

**Training.** In FY97 G/HCD sponsored an extremely successful training workshop in Washington DC. In FY98 we are fine-tuning that presentation and taking it on the road, to three regional workshops. In FY99 and FY2000 we intend to continue the regional outreach program. Much of our professional development, training, and information dissemination requirements can be met through our improved Intranet and Internet websites, along with HCD Reports (a newsletter) and regular emails. However there is no substitute for the creativity and mutual learning that takes place in group events. Our goal is to meet with one-half or more of all Agency staff involved in 3rd Goal programming each year, to sustain the sense of purpose and strong levels of innovation that attend team efforts and one-on-one reinforcement.

## USAID FY 2000 BUDGET REQUEST BY PROGRAM/COUNTRY

18-Aug-98  
01:52 PMCountry/Program: CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. #	Title		Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 99	Estimated Total	FY 2000												Est. Expend. FY 00	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support			Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G						
SSO 1: IMPROVED & EXPANDED BASIC EDUCATION & LEARNING SYSTEMS																				
	CS	Bilateral Field Spt	4,756	4,700 0	4,700										4,000	16,300	0	XX		
		Total	4,756	4,700	4,700		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
SSO 2: EXPANDED HIGHER EDUCATION & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS																				
	DA	Bilateral Field Spt	5,958	4,000 0			4,000								3,000	83,894	0	XX		
		Total	5,958	4,000	0		4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
	DFA	Bilateral Field Spt	7,704	0 0											6,000	140,749	0 0 0	XX		
		Total	7,704	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
SSO 3: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																				
	DA	Bilateral Field Spt	2,478	1,175 0			1,175					0			1,100	63,612	0	XX		
		Total	2,478	1,175	0		1,175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
	DFA	Bilateral Field Spt	8,981	0 0											6,000	159,000	0	XX		
		Total	8,981	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
SSO 4: EXPANDED ACCESS TO & APPLICATION OF INFORMATION & TELECOMMUNICATIONS																				
	DA	Bilateral Field Spt	344	1,900 0			1,900								800	7,500	0	XX		
		Total	344	1,900	0		1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
		Bilateral Field Spt		0 0																
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
		Bilateral Field Spt		0 0																
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0			
Total Bilateral			30,221	11,775	4,700		7,075	0	0		0	0	0	0						
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0						
TOTAL PROGRAM			30,221	11,775	4,700		7,075	0	0		0	0	0	0	20,900	471,055	0			

<b>FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- DA</b>	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise]	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

<b>FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- ESF</b>	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise]	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

NOTE: Prior to FY 1995 G-Bureau did not maintain separate records of core budget pipeline by Strategic Objective. Therefore, amounts shown in the 'Core budget pipelines at end of FY 1997' column in some cases contain field support and other non-core funds.

## USAID FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
01:52 PMCountry/Program: CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 98	Estimated Total	FY 1999										Est. Exp. FY 99	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
					Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G				
SSO 1: IMPROVED & EXPANDED BASIC EDUCATION & LEARNING SYSTEMS																		
	CS	Bilateral	3,161	4,595	4,595										3,000	16,300	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		3,161	4,595	4,595	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 2: EXPANDED HIGHER EDUCATION & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS																		
	AI	Bilateral	500	0											500	1,000	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 3: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																		
	DA	Bilateral	10,158	1,800			1,800								6,000	83,894	0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
	Total		10,158	1,800	0	1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 4: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																		
	DFA	Bilateral	13,704	0									0		6,000	140,749	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		13,704	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 5: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																		
	DA	Bilateral	4,703	775			775								3,000	63,612	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		4,703	775	0	775	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 6: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																		
	DFA	Bilateral	14,981	0											6,000	159,000	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		14,981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 7: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																		
	DA	Bilateral	444	700			700								800	7,500		
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		444	700	0	700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
TOTAL PROGRAM																		
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			47,651	7,870	4,595	3,275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			47,651	7,870	4,595	3,275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,300	472,055	0	

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterpris	0]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	0]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	0]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	0]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

NOTE: Prior to FY 1995 G-Bureau did not maintain separate records of core budget pipeline by Strategic Objective. Therefore, amounts shown in the 'Core budget pipelines at end of FY 1997' column in some cases contain field support and other non-core funds.

## USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
01:52 PMCountry/Program: CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. #, Title		FY 1998															Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 97	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 98	Est. Total Cost life of SO			
SSO 1: IMPROVED & EXPANDED BASIC EDUCATION & LEARNING SYSTEMS																		
DA	Bilateral	2,577	0											2,577	36,600	0	XX	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		2,577	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
CS	Bilateral	3,601	2,460	2,460										2,900	16,300	0	XX	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		3,601	2,460	2,460		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
DFA	Bilateral	6	0											6	4,074	0	XX	
	Field Spt		0													0		
Total		6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
AI	Bilateral	1,000	0									0		500	1,000	0	XX	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
SSO 2: EXPANDED HIGHER EDUCATION & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS																		
DA	Bilateral	12,594	3,564			3,564								6,000	83,894	0	XX	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		12,594	3,564	0	0	3,564	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
DFA	Bilateral	19,704												6,000	140,749	0	XX	
	Field Spt																	
Total		19,704	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
AI	Bilateral	8	0											8	8			
	Field Spt		0															
Total		8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
NI	Bilateral	8	0											8	8			
	Field Spt		0															
Total		8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0		
Total Bilateral							0	0		0	0	0	0					
Total Field Support			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
TOTAL PROGRAM		CONT.	CONT.	CONT.		CONT.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	CONT.	CONT.	0		

<b>FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- DA</b>	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

<b>FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- ESF</b>	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

Program Funding

USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
01:52 PM

Country/Program: CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. #	Title		97	Total	FY 1998										FY 98	SO	2000)	Oblig.
	Acct	Support			Education	Agric.	Growth	Pop	Survival	Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Health	Environ	D/G				
SSO 3: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS OF TARGETED HOST COUNTRY ORGANIZATIONS																		
	DA	Bilateral	7,453	775			775								3,525	63,612	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		7,453	775	0		775	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	DFA	Bilateral	21,188	0											6,207	159,000	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		21,188	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	AI	Bilateral	203	0											203	203	0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
	Total		203	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	NI	Bilateral	346	0									0		346	346	0	XX
		Field Spt		0									0					
	Total		346	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
SSO 4: EXPANDED ACCESS TO & APPLICATION OF INFORMATION & TELECOMMUNICATIONS																		
	DA	Bilateral	544	700			700								800	7,500	0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		544	700	0		700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
	Total		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			69,226	7,499	2,460		5,039	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			69,226	7,499	2,460		5,039	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29,080	513,294	0	

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

NOTE: Prior to FY 1995 G-Bureau did not maintain separate records of core budget pipeline by Strategic Objective. Therefore, amounts shown in the 'Core budget pipelines at end of FY 1997' column in some cases contain field support and other non-core funds.



Office/Bureau: G/CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

00-OE1.WK4

OC	FY 98 Estimate	FY 99 Base	FY 99 Request	FY 00 Base	FY 00 Request
11.8 <b>Special personal services payments</b> IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries	Do not enter data on this line.				
<b>Subtotal OC 11.8</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12.1 <b>Personnel Benefits</b> IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries					
<b>Subtotal OC 12.1</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0 <b>Travel and transportation of persons</b> <b>Training Travel</b>	Do not enter data on this line.				
<b>Operational Travel</b>	Do not enter data on this line.				
Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	90.4	85.9	120.0	85.9	120.0
Site Visits - Mission Personnel					
Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats					
Assessment Travel					
Impact Evaluation Travel					
Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)					
Recruitment Travel					
Other Operational Travel					
<b>Subtotal OC 21.0</b>	90.4	85.9	120.9	85.9	120.9
23.3 <b>Communications, Utilities, and Miscellaneous Charges</b> Commercial Time Sharing	Do not enter data on this line.				
<b>Subtotal OC 23.3</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
24.0 <b>Printing &amp; Reproduction</b> Subscriptions & Publications	Do not enter data on this line.				
<b>Subtotal OC 24.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.1 <b>Advisory and assistance services</b> Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations Management & Professional Support Services Engineering & Technical Services	Do not enter data on this line.				
<b>Subtotal OC 25.1</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2 <b>Other services</b> Non-Federal Audits Grievances/Investigations Manpower Contracts Other Miscellaneous Services Staff training contracts	Do not enter data on this line.				
	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0
<b>Subtotal OC 25.2</b>	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0
25.3 <b>Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts</b> DCAA Audits HHS Audits All Other Federal Audits Reimbursements to Other USAID Accounts All Other Services from other Gov't. Agencies	Do not enter data on this line.				
<b>Subtotal OC 25.3</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.7 <b>Operation &amp; Maintenance of Equipment &amp; Storage</b>					
<b>Subtotal OC 25.7</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.8 <b>Subsistence and support of persons (contract or Gov't.)</b>					
<b>Subtotal OC 25.8</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26.0 <b>Supplies and Materials</b>					
<b>Subtotal OC 26.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
31.0 <b>Equipment</b> ADP Software Purchases ADP Hardware Purchases					
<b>Subtotal OC 31.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	165.4	160.9	195.9	160.9	195.9

] FY 1998 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	3	2	3	3				11	2					3	5	16
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	1	4	3	1				9							0	9
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	4	6	6	4	0	0	0	20	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	25
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows		1		1				2							0	2

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

] FY 1999 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	3	3				12	2					2	4	16
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	1	4	3	1				9							0	9
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	5	6	6	4	0	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	25
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows		2		1				3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

] FY 1999 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	5	3	3	3				14	2					2	4	18
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited																
Program	1	4	3	2				10							0	10
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	28
TAACS	1							1							0	1
Fellows		2		1				3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

] FY 2000 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	3	3				12	2					2	4	16
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited Program	1	4	3	1				9							0	9
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited																
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	5	6	6	4	0	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	25
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows		2		1				3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

] FY 2000 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	5	3	3	3				14	2					2	4	18
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited Program	1	4	3	2				10							0	10
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited																
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:								0							0	0
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	28
TAACS	1							1							0	1
Fellows		2		1				3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

J FY 2001 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	5	3	3	3				14	2					2	4	18
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited Program	1	4	3	2				10							0	10
FSN/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	28
TAACS	1							1							0	1
Fellows		2		1				3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

J Summary On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
FY 1998:																
U.S. Direct Hire	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	16
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	16
Program Funded	1	4	3	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Total FY 1998	4	6	6	4	0	0	0	20	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	25

FY 1999 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	16
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	16
Program Funded	1	4	3	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Total FY 1999 Target	5	6	6	4	0	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	25

FY 1999 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	18
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	18
Program Funded	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Total FY 1999 Request	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	28

FY 2000 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	16
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Total OE Funded Staff	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	16
Program Funded	1	4	3	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Total FY 2000 Target	5	6	6	4	0	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	25

FY 2000 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	18
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staff	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	18
Program Funded	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Total FY 2000 Request	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	28

FY 2001 Estimate:																
U.S. Direct Hire	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	18
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staff	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	18
Program Funded	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Total FY 2000 Target	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	28

MISSION : G/ CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

#### USDH STAFFING REQUIREMENTS BY SKILL CODE

BACKSTOP (BS)	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 98	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 99	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2000	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2001
01SMG	2	2	2	2
02 Program Off.	2	2	2	2
03 EXO				
04 Controller				
05/06/07 Secretary	2	1	1	1
10 Agriculture.				
11Economics				
12 GDO				
12 Democracy				
14 Rural Dev.				
15 Food for Peace				
21 Private Ent.				
25 Engineering				
40 Environ				
50 Health/Pop.				
60 Education	9	12	12	12
75 Physical Sci.	1	1	1	1
85 Legal				
92 Commodity Mgt				
93 Contract Mgt				
94 PDO				
95 IDI				
Other*				
TOTAL	16	18	18	18

\*please list occupations covered by other if there are any